M ORIENNay, We hurl the Truth against falsehood, and it knocks out its brain, and behold, falsehood does perish! (Qur'an 21:18)

A Compendium of Answers to Allegations Against Islam (vol.1)

Abrogation in Qur'an, Alleged errors in Qur'an, Prophet's Married Life, Ahadith about women, Kissing of Black Stone, Killing of Umm Qirfa and much more …

(REVISED EDITION)

26/10/2010

Waqar Akbar Cheema

Concise, comprehensive and teeth-breaking answers to 30 common allegations.
A must read for every Muslim Da'wee in the cyber world.

Wallah! If I had the means I would have flooded the world with such literature.

Tables of Contents

Preface

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم و الصلاة و السلام على خاتم الأنبياء و المرسلين

In the name of Allah, the Most Merciful, the Most Beneficent and all praise and blessings be upon the Last of the Prophets and Messengers.

It was some three years back when I started discussing and debating with non-Muslims on various online forums. And during the course of all those discussions I felt a great need for well researched, concise and comprehensive answers to various questions about Islam raised by different people. While sometimes I did find good answers on various Islamic websites, sometimes I was disappointed. I decided to make up for the gap. I made a dedicated blog for this purpose. And today my blog along with my newly launched website with a little broader scope are a part of my bid to speak for the Truth.

I do not claim that I actually filled the gap or the job is done but with the best of my efforts put in and the heartening response from the readers I hope this effort is atleast worth enough to inspire more people to join in the noble mission of clarifying the doubts and answering the allegations against the Noble Faith of Islam.

I stand in gratitude to all those brothers and sisters who one way or the other helped me in producing these responses. And I thank the Almighty Allah for accepting me for this noble cause.

How to answer the lies against Islam?

Crusades, as they say, may have ended centuries ago but the crusading spirit is alive still. Innumerable polemics written against Islam and slanders against the Holy Prophet (PBUH) and the Holy Quran are a practical manifestation of the same.

Muslims have been putting in their efforts to launch an academic Jihad against this spirit. But in these times when the World Wide Web paradigm has exposed the innocent minds to this ever rising crusading onslaught there is a necessity to arm and enable each one of the Muslims to take up this challenge. In the following lines I give certain points that will, Insha'Allah, help you understand the roots of the lies against Islam and, if a little effort is put in, enable you to expose them.

Following reasons explain as to how certain people are able to make allegations against Islam and why naïve Muslims are taken off-guard. I am confident that if a person has adequate knowledge, he can easily make a rebuttal to all the slanders against our Noble Faith considering the following points. So, here you go;

1- Taking a single Ayah or a Hadith in isolation from the rest of Islamic rubric (rest of the Quran and other Ahadith).
2- Isolating an Ayah or a Hadith from its context.
3- Ignoring the fact that not all Ahadith are authentic; infact some are termed as weak and some even as fabrication by *Muhaddithin* (Masters of the Sciences of Hadith).
4- Extensive use of the traditions from history books like those of Al-Tabari, Ibn Ishaaq and Ibn S'ad etc which contain raw material about early Muslims and include numerous unauthentic narrations. Infact their compilers didn't take the amount of care as is done in Hadith compilations. (Scholars did their best either not to narrate unauthentic narrations or to mention their weakness when they dealt with narrations of legal and juristic importance but not so with those merely of historical import).
5- Disregard to the fact that not all the narrations that may have connected chains of trustworthy narrators serve as evidence. One needs to take into account what other narrators relate about the same issue and compare with different narrations before making an inference or deduction.
6- Indifference to the delicacies and subtleties of the Arabic language. A single word or phrase may have quite different meanings in different contexts.
7- Not understanding the peculiar environment and culture of 7th A.C. Arabia especially when it comes to the life of the Holy Prophet (PBUH) and his companions.
8- Ignoring the fact that's it's the Arabic text of the Quran and Ahadith that matters and not the translations and commentaries.
9- 'Overlooking' the fact that when it comes to explanation and commentary, no single scholar is an absolute authority in the House of Islam. Opinion of any scholar, however erudite, may be rejected or ignored subject to *valid* reasons.

1-<u>Does Allah misguide people?</u>

Christians try their best to make issue of certain Qur'anic verses and argue that Allah Himself misguides people. They use many different verses. Today let's have wholesome look into the issue and unveil the slanders against the Noble Faith of Islam.

There are three set or types of verses that are used by the polemics.

1- Verses on the lines that Allah guides and misguides whom He wills.

2- Verses that use the Arabic word '*ghayy*' or '*ghawa*'.

3- Verses that say Allah has sealed the hearts of so and so people.

In the following lines we consider these types of verses one by one. But before that we need to understand the word '*Hadaya*' i.e. guidance as Qur'an speaks of it.

1- <u>Meaning of 'Guidance' (*Hadaya*)</u>:

The Holy Qur'an speaks of certain Guidance on certain degrees. The first degree of guidance is universal and is granted to all beings, living and otherwise:

"He said: 'Our Lord is He Who gave to each (created) thing its form and nature, and further, gave (it) guidance.'" (Qur'an 20:50)

This means Allah has given every creation a particular function and then guided it to correspond to its role in the scheme of things. This guidance is granted to everything and everyone, men, jinn, animals, plants and all the other creation.

The second degree is only for men and the jinn i.e. creation that will be help accountable for its deeds. This guidance is always there and one is free to work for it or reject it.

"By the Soul, and the proportion and order given to it; And its enlightenment as to its wrong and its right; Truly he succeeds that purifies it, And he fails that corrupts it!"

And third degree of guidance is for those who heed to the message of Truth and grants them more help in their pursuit of righteousness.

"But to those who receive Guidance, He increases the (light of) Guidance, and bestows on them their Piety and Restraint (from evil)." (Qur'an 47:17)

So when Allah says that He does not guide people it only refers to the third degree of guidance and this He does only because they do not show the yearning for what is the prerequisite for it.

2- Meaning of 'Allah guides whom He Wills…':

There are some verses in the Holy Qur'an which say that Allah guides whom He wills and leaves straying who He wills e.g. Surah 14 Ayah 4 where it reads:

'…Now Allah leaves straying those whom He pleases and guides whom He pleases: and He is Exalted in power, full of Wisdom.' (Qur'an 14:4)

Some people especially Christian polemics argue that Allah Himself misguides people and does not give them free-will and therefore He would be unjust in punishing them. This is utterly wrong interpretation!

We have been arguing for long that no Qur'anic verse should be taken in isolation from the rest of the Qur'an and the Ahadith.

3- Man has the choice:

Other passages of the Qur'an refute such an interpretation. Qur'an infact maintains that Allah has made the Truth and Falsehood clear and now man has the choice to accept either of them.

"By the Soul, and the proportion and order given to it; And its enlightenment as to its wrong and its right; Truly he succeeds that purifies it, And he fails that corrupts it!" (Qur'an 91:7-10)

"Say, 'The truth is from your Lord': Let him who will believe, and let him who will, reject (it): for the wrong-doers We have prepared a Fire whose (smoke and flames), like the walls and roof of a tent, will hem them in:" (Qur'an 18:29)

4- Those whom Allah guide:

Now we see who does Allah guide and whom He leaves straying and at the same time Allah also clarifies who what is for whom.

"…He guideth to Himself those who turn to Him in penitence," (Qur'an 13:27)

"And those who strive in Our (cause),- We will certainly guide them to our Paths: For verily Allah is with those who do right." (Qur'an 29:69)

"Allah chooses to Himself those whom He pleases, and guides to Himself those who turn (to Him)." (Qur'an 42:13)

5- Those whom He misguides:

And similarly He plainly tells us;

"…He causes not to stray, except those who forsake (the path)," (Qur'an 2:26)

"…but Allah will leave, to stray, those who do wrong: Allah doeth what He willeth." (Qur'an 14:27)

6- How does Allah misguide?

Now is the question as to how Allah misguides? This is plainly told in the Qur'an.

"If anyone contends with the Messenger even after guidance has been plainly conveyed to him, and follows a path other than that becoming to men of Faith, We shall leave him in the path he has chosen, and land him in Hell,- what an evil refuge!" (Qur'an 4:115)

So Allah misguides the evil doers and those who reject the guidance brought by the Messenger by letting him follow the path they choose.

Through His signs He makes things clear and those who will and show passion to follow the Truth, He guides them further and but those who resort to evil, He lets them follow the path they choose, so He wouldn't be unjust in punishing such.

7- <u>Meaning of the verse 'If Allah leads you astray (*yughwiyakum*) ...'</u>:

Some quote Qur'an 11:34 which speaks of Prophet Noah saying to his rebellious people;

"Of no profit will be my counsel to you, much as I desire to give you (good) counsel, if it be that Allah willeth to leave you astray (*yughwiyakum*): He is your Lord! and to Him will ye return!" (Qur'an 11:34)

We have to see that here Prophet Noah is speaking to the people when they have crossed all limits and even challenged to bring the torment that he used to warned them of. So here Allah's act of misleading is just as explained earlier i.e. He will leave them on the path they have chosen by stubbornly rejecting the Truth. And this may even be about the punishment, the torment that Prophet Noah knew was due for these people because the same word is used in the meanings of punishment and destruction as well. In Qur'an 19:59 we read:

"But after them there followed a posterity who missed prayers and followed after lusts soon, then, will they face Destruction (*ghayya*)," (Qur'an 19:59)

Some use Qur'an 7:16 and 15:39:

"He said: "Because thou hast thrown me out of the way (*aghwaytanee*), lo! I will lie in wait for them on thy straight way:" (Qur'an 7:16)

"(Iblis) said: 'O my Lord! because Thou hast put me in the wrong (aghwaytanee), I will make (wrong) fair-seeming to them on the earth, and I will put them all in the wrong,-'" (Qur'an 15:39)

But interestingly one can see that these are only the words of Satan who is just seeking excuses for his transgression by slandering that Almighty Allah misled him. Only the Satanic souls turn to these verses for proving their point!

8- <u>Meaning of the saying that 'Allah seals the hearts..'</u>:

Some people argue that when Allah Himself says that He puts seal on the heart of disbelievers then why are they to be blamed for their acts. Such arguments come only because of the basic misunderstanding of the whole issue.

Allah seals the hearts of only those who stubbornly reject the message or simply as explained above, Allah seals the hearts of those who reject the second degree of guidance which is universal and only needs one own will to

be attained. So we see that whenever Allah says something on these lines in the Qur’an it's always about the stern rejecters of Truth e.g. Qur’an 2:7, 4:168 & 16:106-109. All such passages talk about those who reject the Truth and do no show the will to follow the Right Path.

9- Summary:

The gist of the matter is that Allah grants guidance to all by making the Truth and Falsehood clear through His signs within our own selves and the phenomenon around and through the Holy Prophets and the scriptures and everyone is free to follow it. One who hearkens to the message and shows yearning Allah guides him further but one who rejects the Truth Allah lets him follow the way he likes (Qur’an 4:115) and withholds the further degrees of guidance from him, seals the hearts of such and lets him astray.

Questions for Missionaries:

Christian missionaries keep saying such things about Qur’an and malign Islam but they 'forget' for the same applies to their Book of Authority, Bible, as well.

10- God hardened the heart of Pharaoh according to the Bible:

At least at six places Bible tells that Gods hardened the heart of Pharaoh and he against the Will of the God did not let the people of Israel go.

"And the LORD said unto Moses, When thou goest to return into Egypt, see that thou do all those wonders before Pharaoh, which I have put in thine hand: but I will harden his heart, that he shall not let the people go." (Exodus 4:21)

Same thing is repeated in Exodus 7:3, 10:1, 10:20 & 10:27.

See how God hardens the heart of the greatest transgressor. Those who speak against Qur’an, what they have to say about this?

11- God didn't give Israel the heart to perceive and eyes to see…:

Here are more interesting things for the Christians who malign Islam.

"Yet the LORD hath not given you a heart to perceive, and eyes to see, and ears to hear, unto this day." (Deuteronomy 29:4)

"He hath blinded their eyes, and hardened their heart; that they should not see with their eyes, nor understand with their heart, and be converted, and I should heal them." (John 12:40)

'(According as it is written, God hath given them the spirit of slumber, eyes that they should not see, and ears that they should not hear;) unto this day.' (Romans 11:8)

12- God in the Bible misleads the Prophets even:

There are many who refer to Qur'an 7:16 and 15:30 wherein Satan is reported as slandering Almighty Allah to have mislead him but in the Bible even the Prophets, the chosen one of the God say that they are mislead by Him.

"O LORD, why hast thou made us to err from thy ways, and hardened our heart from thy fear? Return for thy servants' sake, the tribes of thine inheritance." (Isaiah 63:17)

"And if the prophet be deceived when he hath spoken a thing, I the LORD have deceived that prophet, and I will stretch out my hand upon him, and will destroy him from the midst of my people Israel." (Ezekiel 14:9)

What about this? Can some Christian explain?

Remember Christ (PBUH) said: **"And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."** (John 8:32)

2- Truth about Abrogation in Qur'an

One of the favorite topics of missionaries is Abrogation in Qur'an. Giving a notion as if abrogated verses were lost they try to put the authenticity of Qur'an to doubt. Let's today explain as to what abrogation is and what are the facts about specific narrations they bring forward?

1- What is abrogation and the Quranic scheme about it?

Now let me explain abrogation is and what it's not as I know Christians normally tend to be very amazed at God abrogating His own verses. But unfortunately their amazement is only when it comes to Qur'an.

Abrogation as it is in Qur'an does not mean that Allah changed his mind but rather it's like a physician changing the medicine.

When some rules are abrogated and replaced by some other rules then it means that Allah in His wisdom changed the rules. It is just like **'…A physician prescribes a medicine for the patient in view of his present conditions, but he knows when the patient has been using it for two days, his conditions will change and require a new medicine – with this realization, he prescribes a medicine suitable for that day, but two days later, when circumstances have changed, he prescribes a new one. The physician can easily give the patient written instructions for the whole course of treatment, with all the changes in medicine duly indicated. But this would be putting too much burden on already feeble patient and there would also be danger of harm through a possible error or misunderstanding.'** (Ma'ariful Qur'an vol.1 under 2:106)

Further about abrogation Allah Almighty says in the Qur'an;

“None of Our revelations do We abrogate or cause to be forgotten, but We substitute something better or similar: Knowest thou not that Allah Hath power over all things?” (Qur’an 2:106)

Sometimes it was plainly told that a verse previously revealed stands abrogated and sometimes before such any announcement people were made to forget it. An account of it is given in a Hadith which says that a person tried to recite a surah but he couldn’t remember it except for ‘*Bismillahi Ar-Rahman Al-Rahim’* so next morning he came to the Holy Prophet (PBUH)to ask about it and similarly some other people also as the same happened to them as well. So the Holy Prophet (PBUH) said in response:
‘This was abrogated yesterday.’
(Mushkil Al-Athar 5/35 Hadith 1711. the narration is authentic. See Footnote to Al-Ittiqan section 47 p.1463 pub. Saudi Ministry of Islamic publications)

This is a manifestation how Allah causes people to forget the previous revelations He intends not to be retained and preserved.

Having said this let’s move to the particular cases often brought forward;

1) Issue of verse about stoning (Answered HERE)
2) Issue of verse about breastfeeding (Answered HERE)
3) Issue of verse about Son of Adam having valleys of gold
4) Issue of verse about companions of Bir-Mauna

2- Issue of verse about Son of Adam having valleys of gold:

The narration in Sahīh Muslim goes as:

Abu Musa al-Ash'ari sent for the reciters of Basra. They came to him and they were three hundred in number. They recited the Qur'an and he said: You are the best among the inhabitants of Basra, for you are the reciters among them. So continue to recite it. (But bear in mind) that your reciting for a long time may not harden your hearts as were hardened the hearts of those before you. We used to recite a surah which resembled in length and severity to (Surah) Bar’at. I have, however, forgotten it with the exception of this which I remember out of it:" If there were two valleys full of riches, for the son of Adam, he would long for a third valley, and nothing would fill the stomach of the son of Adam but dust."
(Sahīh Muslim, Kitubul Zakat, Hadith 1740)

Certainly we do not find a surah with this verse this verse in the Qur’an now. So what happened of it? Infact it was abrogated and another surah was revealed instead;

Narrated Anas bin Malik the Messenger of Allah (PBUH) said; "If the son of Adam were given a valley full of gold, he would love to have a second one; and if he were given the second one, he would love to have a third, for nothing fills the belly of Adam's son except dust. And Allah forgives he who repents to Him."

Ubai said, "We considered this as a saying from the Qur'an till the Sura (beginning with) 'The mutual rivalry for piling up of worldly things diverts you..' (102.1) was revealed."
(Sahīh Bukhari, Kitabul Riqaq, Hadith 5959)

Now if you compare the known part of the abrogated surah, **'If the son of Adam were given a valley full of gold, he would love to have a second one; and if he were given the second one, he would love to have a third, for nothing fills the belly of Adam's son except dust.'** With Quran chapter 102 **'The mutual rivalry for piling up (the good things of this world) diverts you (from the more serious things), Until ye visit the graves.'**..Both these clearly relate to man's insatiable crave for worldly riches. It thus complies with the general principle of abrogation; **'but We substitute something better or similar.'**

3- <u>Issue of verse about companions of B'ir-Mauna</u>:

Narrated Anas bin Malik: For thirty days Allah's Messenger (PBUH)invoked Allah to curse those who had killed the companions of Bir-Mauna; he invoked evil upon the tribes of Ra'l, Dhakwan, and Usaiya who disobeyed Allah and His Messenger. There was reveled about those who were killed at Bir-Mauna a Quranic Verse we used to recite, but it was cancelled later on. The Verse was: "Inform our people that we have met our Lord. He is pleased with us and He has made us pleased" (Sahīh Bukhari, Kitabul Jihad, Hadith 2603)

Again as the tradition clearly says the verse was abrogated. Another narration clarifies that in its stead was revealed another verse.

Anas bin Malik said it was revealed in Qur'an about the companions of B'ir Mauna; 'Convey to our people that we met Allah and He was pleased with us and made us pleased' then it was abrogated and and Allah revealed; 'Think not of those as dead who are killed in the way of Allah. Nay, they are alive, with their Lord, and they have provision.'(Qur'an 3:169)

(Mushkil l-Athar 5/43 Hadith 1718. Similar narrations have been quoted by Ibn Jarir Tabari [7/393 Hadith 8224] and Ibn Kathir [2/161] under surah 3 ayah 169. Albani classified it as Hasan. See Ibn Kathir 1/455 Urdu Ed.)

Clearly the abrogated verse in question and the one revealed in its stead are similar in essence as they talk about Allah's blessings for those martyrs. It thus agrees with the Quranic scheme of abrogation.

4- <u>A statement of Ibn 'Umar and its true meaning</u>:

In Suyuti's Al-Ittiqan there is statement of Ibn 'Umar which is often used by the polemicists and they present it in a manner to make it convey what it doesn't.

Narrated from Ibn 'Umar that he said, 'One of you says that he has grasped the whole of Qur'an and he does not know the a lot of it has been taken away but let him say that he has got from what remains.'
(Al-Ittiqan section 47 p.1455)

What Ibn ‘Umar wanted to highlight was the same fact mentioned above that not whole of the what was at different times revealed now remains and some of it has been taken away by the way of abrogation and removal from memory. So one can only learn what has remained of it. Infact what was made to forget could never be remembered by anyone as it is clear from the incident quoted earlier.

Therefore the way these anti-Islamic polemicists quote this narration to assert that parts of Qur’an have been lost is cunning and misleading.

5- Summary of Abrogation in Qur’an:

The discussion above proves abrogation doesn’t cause any doubt about the preservation and authenticity of the Holy Qur’an. Only such parts have been taken away which were not required to be preserved and were dropped by according to the Divine plan after verses similar or better were revealed instead. Nor does it mean that Allah changed his mind. The example of physician prescribing for the patient above clarifies it well.

6- Proof of abrogation from the Bible

There are many commandments in the Bible that changed. Instead of discussing them I give concrete references for abrogation declared in the Bible.

‘For the priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law.’ (Hebrews 7:12)

Well known Christian commentator Adam Clarke writes under this verse:

‘The priesthood, therefore, being changed, Jesus coming in the place of Aaron, the law of ordinances and ceremonies, which served only to point out the Messiah, must of necessity be changed also.’

7- Lost books of the Bible:

Infact there were many books to which even the authors of the Canonical books also referred but they are lost or atleast not in the Bible.

Some of them are:

1- The **Book of the Wars of the Lord** mentioned in Numbers 21:14
2- Book **of Jasher** mentioned in Joshua 10: 13 etc
3- Book **of Nathan the Prophet** mentioned in 2-Chronicles 9: 29
4- Acts **of Rehoboam** & **Book of Shemaiah the Prophet** mentioned in 2-Chronicles 12:15
5- Book **of the acts of Solomon** mentioned in 1-Kings 11:41
6- **Acts of Uzziah** mentioned in 2-Chronicles 26:22

This proves that the teachings of the prophets have been lost. Do Christians have any scriptural proof or historical evidence that nothing of value has been lost in these books and their teachings and records have been preserved in their so-called canon now?

3- Myth of the lost verse about stoning exposed

Christian missionaries and other anti-Islamic polemics try to question the authority of the Qur'an by misinterpreting the following Hadith about the punishment of stoning.

"**In the meantime, 'Umar sat on the pulpit** and when the call makers for the prayer had finished their call, 'Umar stood up, and having glorified and praised Allah as He deserved, he said, "Now then, I am going to tell you something which (Allah) has written for me to say. I do not know; perhaps it portends my death, so whoever understands and remembers it, must narrate it to the others wherever his mount takes him, but if somebody is afraid that he does not understand it, then it is unlawful for him to tell lies about me. **Allah sent Muhammad with the Truth and revealed the Holy Book to him, and among what Allah revealed, was the Verse of the Rajam (the stoning of married person (male & female) who commits illegal sexual intercourse, and we did recite this Verse and understood and memorized it. Allah's Messenger did carry out the punishment of stoning and so did we after him. I am afraid that after a long time has passed, somebody will say, 'By Allah, we do not find the Verse of the Rajam in Allah's Book,' and thus they will go astray by leaving an obligation which Allah has revealed. And the punishment of the Rajam is to be inflicted to any married person (male & female), who commits illegal sexual intercourse, if the required evidence is available or there is conception or confession."** (Bukhari, Hadith 6328)

The problem with all these anti-Islamic polemics is that they only pick up a tradition or two and base all their arguments on their own explanations not understanding that Islamic treasury of traditions is quite rich and well able to expose any self styled hallow research scholar. Let's make a detailed study of the issue at hand.

1- Truth about the origin of the alleged verse:

Some traditions suggest that the wording of that verse is 'When a married man or woman commit adultery stone them (to death)'. But the fact, which becomes evident looking at all the various traditions, is that this was never meant to be part of the Qur'an. The word 'revealed' is used about this only in a metaphorical sense. This was perhaps a verse from one of the Books of the Jews and it was not revealed as a part of the Qur'an but its order was upheld through revelation so it remains in place.

The following tradition recorded by Tabari in his Tafsir points to the fact that it was a part of earlier revelations.

Ibn Jarir Tabari relates in his commentary of Surah Maida in connection to the incident of stoning of Jews.

The Holy Prophet (pbuh) said to them: 'Who is the most learned of the Law among you?'. They replied, 'so and so Al-A'war (i.e. Abdullah bin Souriya)'. He was called upon and he came. So the Prophet (pbuh) said: 'Are you the most learned of the Law among them?' He said, 'Jews think so.' So the Prophet (pbuh) said to him; 'By Allah and by the Law that He gave Moses on the day at Sinai, (tell me) what you find in the Law regarding adulterers?' He said: 'O Abul Qasim (i.e. Prophet), they stone the despicable

(adulterer), and make the rich (if he does it) sit on the camel, blacken his face and make him face camel's back and stone the despicable if he commits adultery with a rich woman and they do the same to her.' So (again) the Prophet (pbuh) said to him: 'By Allah and by the Law that He gave Moses on the day at Sinai, (tell me) what you find in the Law?' He started to beat around the bush and the Prophet (pbuh) urged him by Allah and by the Law that He gave Moses on the day at Sinai till he said: 'O Abul Qasim, 'When a married man or woman commit adultery stone them.' So the Prophet (pbuh) said: 'It is like that, take them (the Jews who committed adultery) and stone them.' (Tafsir Ibn Jarir Al-Tabari 10/328 Narration 11976)

Now it's clear this verse as Abdullah bin Souriya spoke is similar to a verse in the Law (i.e. Torah). Even today we can find similar injunctions in the Bible i.e. Deuteronomy 22.

2- Meanings of the Hadith in question:

Let it be known that in Islam revelation is not only what constitutes the Holy Qur'an, infact there were other revelations as well as Holy Prophet (pbuh) did not speak on his own. (Qur'an 53:3)

Having said this, now let's analyze the wording of the Hadith in question.

Firstly it says, **'Allah sent Muhammad with the Truth'**, here 'Truth' refers to all forms of revelation i.e. both Qur'an and Prophet's sayings. Next we read, **'and revealed the Holy Book to him'**, here the first word is 'and' which is used as i.e. in conjunctive sense (separating the two phrases) and it continues **'revealed the Holy Book to him'** i.e. the Qur'an. Then it reads, **'and among what Allah revealed, was the Verse of the *Rajm* stoning)'**, here 'what Allah revealed' includes both types of revelation and not only the Book as we again have the conjunction, 'and', separating the two phrases. And we do find the 'verse' about stoning in a saying of the Holy Prophet (pbuh):

Narrated by 'Ajma, she said: **I heard that Messenger of Allah say; 'When a married man or woman commit adultery stone them both to death.'** (Tabarani Kabeer, Hadith 20321)

3- It was never meant to be a part of the Qur'anic text:

There are more proofs that it was not at all meant to be the part of the Qur'anic script.

1-It is reported in a narration from Kathir bin Salt that: Zaid (b. Thabit) said: 'I heard the Messenger of Allah say, 'When a married, man or woman, commit adultery stone them both (to death)', (hearing this) Amr said,

'When this was revealed I came to Prophet and asked if I could write it, he (the Prophet) disliked it.' (Mustadrik Al-Hakim, Hadith 8184)[1]

2- About this 'verse' Kathir bin Salt says that he, Zaid bin Thabit and Marwan bin Hakam were discussing as to why it is not written in the Qur'anic manuscript and Umar bin Khattab was present with them and listening to their discussion he said he knew it better then them and told them that he came to Messenger of Allah and said:

[1] Hakim called it Sahih

"'O Messenger of Allah, let the verse about stoning be written for me.' He (the Prophet) said, 'I can't do this.'" (Sunan Al-Kubra Baihiqi 8/211 & Sunan Al-Kubra Nasai Hadith 7148)[1]

Who could stop the Prophet (pbuh) from writing this verse in the Qur'an if it was supposed to be? Indeed it was not meant to be written in the Qur'an and that's why Holy Prophet disliked its idea of its being written down.

Infact it was a verse from an earlier book as proved from Tabari's narration above and since its instruction was upheld through revelation so it is referred to as a 'verse' and the word 'sent down' or 'revealed' are used for it.

4- Is stoning (*rajm*) mentioned in the Qur'an today?

And as to Caliph Umar's statement 'the people may say: We do not find the punishment of stoning in the Book of Allah.', it only refers to categorical mentioning otherwise Qur'an does point to the punishment of stoning. Infact Qur'an 5:43-44 were revealed about punishment of stoning and the words 'Command of Allah' (v.43) and 'What Allah hath revealed' (v.44) refer to punishment of stoning. This becomes absolutely clear considering the traditions that Ibn Kathir, Tabari and Qurtubi etc. have brought in commentary to these verses.

And when Caliph Umar said, 'Stoning is a duty laid down in Allah's Book' he only referred to verses 43-44 of Surah 5 as mentioned above. Also we need to know that the Companions of the Prophet (pbuh) used to consider something proved from Hadith as important and as authentic as being in the Qur'an. The following tradition testifies to it.

'Abdullah (bin Masud) said. "Allah curses those ladies who practice tattooing and those who get themselves tattooed, and those ladies who remove the hair from their faces and those who make artificial spaces between their teeth in order to look more beautiful whereby they change Allah's creation." His saying reached a lady from Bani Asd called Umm Yaqub who came (to Abdullah) and said, "I have come to know that you have cursed such-and-such (ladies)?" He replied, "Why should I not curse these whom Allah's Messenger has cursed and who are (cursed) in Allah's Book!" Um Yaqub said, "I have read the whole Qur'an, but I did not find in it what you say." He said, "Verily, if you have read it (i.e. the Qur'an), you have found it. Didn't you read: 'And whatsoever the Messenger gives you take it and whatsoever he forbids you, you abstain (from it).' (59.7). She replied, "Yes, I did," He said, "Verily, Allah's Messenger forbade such things. (Bukhari, Hadith 4507)

And as we know that punishment of stoning is clearly established in Hadith so Caliph Umar's statement can well be taken on that account.

5- Did Caliph Umar actually think some verse was missing?

Most certainly Caliph Umar knew well and understood that the particular words 'When a married man or woman commit adultery, stone them (to death)'are not meant to be the part of the actual text of the Holy Qur'an. This is clear from another tradition in which he said:

"Had it not been that people would say Umar has made an addition to the Book of Allah, I would have written it on the margin of the Qur'an."(Musnad Ahmad Hadith 151)[2]

[1] Albani (in Sahiha 6/412) said Baihiqi pointed to its authenticity
[2] Ahmad Shakir classified it as Sahih

And according to the wording in Sunan Nasai Al-Kubra Hadith 7151, he said;

'I would have written and appended it to the Qur'an.'

Now idea of writing at the margin of the Qur'an or adding as an appendix clearly shows that he only meant to add it as side note or commentary to the Qur'an to tell the future generations explicitly about the punishment of stoning whom he feared rejecting this commandment and going astray.

The above detail makes it absolutely clear that never was there any verse about stoning a part of the Qur'anic text.

4- <u>Lie of the lost verse about breastfeeding exposed</u>

There is a Hadith reported from Sayyidah 'Aisha (RA) which gives a notion as if some verse about five suckling was revealed and was recited till the death of the Holy Prophet (PBUH) which is obviously not found in any of the Qur'anic manuscripts known in history. The tradition goes as:

'**A'isha (Allah be pleased with, her) reported that it had been revealed in the Holy Qur'an that ten clear sucklings make the marriage unlawful, then it was abrogated (and substituted) by five sucklings and Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) died and it was before that time (found) in the Holy Qur'an (and recited by the Muslims).** (Sahih Muslim, Hadith 2634)

This gives the impression that the verses was lost after the Holy Prophet (PBUH), if so, this is against the established Islamic idea that nothing was abrogated from the Qur'an after the Prophet and it is to-the-letter same as left by him.

1- <u>Solitary reports do not prove things about Qur'an</u>:

Many scholars have very strongly rejected this tradition. No doubt its chain of narrators is otherwise fine but when it comes to Qur'an then there must be *mutawatir* traditions to prove something to be a part of it. This is not the case regarding the issue in hand. It has only been reported this way so from Sayyidah 'Aisha (RA) through a single narrator and therefore learned scholars continue to contend the apparent meaning of this tradition.

Imam Nawawi writes in his monumental commentary of Sahih Muslim under this Hadith that scholars reject this tradition saying:

'Qur'an is not proved from a solitary report (*khabr wahid*).' (Sharah Al-Nawawi 5/183)

The words that attract our attention the most in this tradition are:

'Allah's Messenger (PBUH) died and it was before that time (found) in the Holy Qur'an (and recited by the Muslims).'

Now looking at the various versions of this tradition from Sayyidah ‘Aisha we find it is only through a narrator, Abdullah bin Abi Bakr, that these words are narrated i.e. he is unique in relating these particular words. The other versions that are narrated through Qasim bin Muhammad and Yahya bin Saeed do not contain these words and as a matter of fact both of them are more reliable and trustworthy then Abdullah bin Abi Bakr as stated by Imam Tahawi in Mushkil al-Athaar 10/171.

It is narrator's own assumption, not a fact:

Infact scholars have said this is merely an assumption on the part of the narrator Abdullah bin Abi Bakr. Imam Tahawi says;

'This is something we do not know from any other narrator except Abdullah bin Abi Bakr and to us it is merely an assumption on his part.' (Mushkil al-Athaar 5/73 under Hadith 1740)

Similarly Shaykh Ibn Arabi also calls it merely an assumption on the narrator's part in his 'Aardha al- Ahwazi 5/92.

2- Even five suckling's command was abrogated:

Infact there are solid evidences that recitation and even the injunction about five breastfeeds was also abrogated in the lifetime of the Holy Prophet (pbuh).

In Musannaf Abdul Razzaq it is related that Sayyidah ‘Aisha (RA) said:

'Indeed ten breastfeeds were mentioned in the Qur’an (as making marriage unlawful through foster relation), then it was changed by five and there was nothing but it was abrogated in the presence of the Holy Prophet (pbuh).' (Musannaf Abdul Razzaq, Hadith 13928)

Shaykh Taqi Usmani says: **'This tradition of Sayyidah ‘Aisha is points that recitation of the five breastfeeds verse was abrogated before the death of the Prophet (PBUH).'** (Takmala Fath al- Mulhim 1/46)

This is true because Sayyidah ‘Aisha lived long after the Holy Prophet (pbuh) and was there when Sayyidina Abu Bakr (RA), her father, got the first official copy of the Qur’an prepared and even at the time of Sayyidina Usman (RA) made multiple copies of the same. And we know Sayyidah ‘Aisha (RA) held a very high position among the companions in matters of knowledge of the Qur’an and Sunnah. Also we know that some of the well known recitations (*qir'ats*) of the Holy Qur’an are traced back to Sayyidah ‘Aisha (RA) and none of them contain any such words thus the opinion of the scholars that these particular words are only an assumption on part of the narrator is further supported by this.

3- Even a single suckle proves foster relation:

Infact there was a gradual change in the command regarding this issue. Firstly it was said that ten breastfeeds make marriage unlawful through foster relationship. Then it was abrogated by five and at last it was said that even a single suckle within infancy proves foster relationship.

Narrated Tawus from Ibn Abbas that he was asked about breastfeeding, so I said: People say that one or two suckling do not make (marriage) unlawful (through foster relations). He said: 'It was like that but now even one makes unlawful.' (Ahkam al-Qur'an by Jassas 4/224)

Also it is related in Musannaf Abdul Razzaq:

Tawus (d. 106 A.H. and was a pupil of many companions including Sayyidah 'Aisha) said that:

'Wives of the Holy Prophet (pbuh) held that a specific number of breastfeeds prove the foster relation.' He further said: 'Then this (opinion) was later left thus now little or more suckling makes marriage unlawful.' (Musannaf Abdul Razzaq, Hadith 13914)

4- <u>Why changes in the command?</u>

The wisdom behind this gradual change in the commandment was that in Arabia back then fostering other's children was a normal practice and as it had implication on possible future marriages so the command was gradually made strict not to cause much consternation in the society.

5- <u>Conclusion</u>:

All this clarifies that the tradition, if critically examined, does not cast any doubt whatsoever on the Qur'an and its authenticity. Infact the recitation and the command regarding five breastfeeds was abrogated. One must either follow our rules of considering different narrations or muster up the courage to challenge their rationale.

(As the real intention was not to discuss the issue of jurisprudence that how many breastfeeds prove the foster relation, the details and further arguments can be seen in *Takmala Fath al-Mulhim* vol.1, commentary on Sahih Muslim by Shaykh Taqi Usmani)

5- <u>Lie of the Satanic Verse exposed</u>

Some notorious anti-Islamic sites have written this thing and are polluting the minds of innocent people. Let us have a detailed look in to the story and examine it critically.

<u>What they have written</u>:

Here are reproduce the statement from a notorious site;

"According to al-Tabari,
When the Messenger of God saw how his tribe turned their backs on him and was grieved to see them shunning the message he had brought to them from God, he longed in his soul that something would come to him from God which would reconcile him with his tribe. With his love for his tribe and his eagerness for their welfare it would have delighted him if some of the difficulties which they made for him could have been smoothed out, and

he debated within himself and fervently desired such an outcome. Then God revealed:
By the Star when it sets, your comrade does not err, nor is he deceived; nor does he speak out of (his own) desire . . .
and when he came to the words:
Have you thought upon al-Lat and al-'Uzza and Manat, the third, the other?
Satan cast on his tongue, because of his inner debates and what he desired to bring to his people, the words: These are the high-flying cranes; verily their intercession is accepted with approval. (Al-Tabari, p. 108)"
The polytheists were delighted that Muhammad had at last approved of their gods. To return the kindness, they "prostrated themselves because of the reference to their gods which they had heard, so that there was no one in the mosque, believer or unbeliever, who did not prostrate himself" (p. 109).
Muhammad's friendly relations with the polytheists were short-lived, however, for he soon learned that his verses praising pagan idols came not from God, but from Satan. Saddened to recognize his treachery against Allah, Muhammad lamented: "I have fabricated things against God and have imputed to Him words which He has not spoken" (p. 111). Yet "Gabriel" comforted Muhammad, informing him that all prophets fall for Satan's tricks from time to time. This staggering and unbelievable claim even found its way into the Qur'an:
"And We did not send before you any Messenger or prophet, but when he desired, the Shaitan made a suggestion respecting his desire; but Allah annuls that which the Shaitan casts, then does Allah establish His communications, and Allah is Knowing, Wise." (Surah 22:52)"

My response

1- About the Book, Tarīkh ar-Rusul wal-Maluk, commonly known as Tarīkh al-Tabari*:*

First of all we ought to know that Tarīkh al-Tabari is not a Hadith book but only a history book thus its authenticity level is far below than any Hadith book. Infact it is one of the earlier books giving much raw material about the life of the Holy Prophet (PBUH) and generations immediately after him. Everything in it is not necessarily true. Imam Tabari himself writes in his preface (*Muqaddama*) to the book.

"Let him who examines this book of mine know that I have relied, as regards everything I mention therein which I stipulate to be described by me, solely upon what has been transmitted to me by way of reports which I cite therein and traditions which I ascribe to their narrators, to the exclusion of what may be apprehended by rational argument or deduced by the human mind, except in very few cases. This is because knowledge of the reports of men of the past and of contemporaneous views of men of the present do not reach the one who has not witnessed them nor lived in their times except through the accounts of reporters and the transmission of transmitters, to the exclusion of rational deduction and mental inference. **Hence, if I mention in this book a report about some men of the past, which the reader of listener finds objectionable or worthy of censure because he can see no aspect of truth nor any factual substance therein, let him know that this is not to be attributed to us but to those who transmitted it to us and we have merely passed this on as it has been passed on to us."** (Tarīkh al-Tabari 1/3)

He has only rendered what he heard and he left it to us, the readers, to examine the truth of statements through internal & external examination and rational testing.

2-Internal Examination:

Now let's try to read that words which according to this story Holy Prophet (PBUH) allegedly recited with its context. The words in blue are the words which the Holy Prophet (PBUH) allegedly recited;

"Have ye seen Lat. and 'Uzza, And another, the third (goddess), Manat?" ***"These are exalted goddesses; indeed their intercession may be accepted."*** **"What! for you the male sex, and for Him, the female? Behold, such would be indeed a division most unfair! These are nothing but names which ye have devised,- ye and your fathers,- for which Allah has sent down no authority (whatever). They follow nothing but conjecture and what their own souls desire! - Even though there has already come to them Guidance from their Lord!"** (Al-Qur'an 53:19-23 with that supposed statement inserted as underlined)

Now any one can observe, unless he is a cynic, that these words no where fit in the context. How it be that first those pagan deities are praised and in the very next verse condemned that you attribute females to God? And if the story is true than were all the ever criticizing Pagans of Quraysh out of their senses that they prostrated along with Muhammad on the premise that he had praised their deities? What non-sense can be greater than this? This passage if read along with those alleged verses spoken by Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) is meaning less.

3-External Examination:

Now this incident happened just after the Emigration to Abyssinia that took place in the 5th year after the Holy Prophet (PBUH) announced his prophethood. And it was then when these verses of Surah an-Najam (53) were revealed. (Maududi's Introduction to Surah 53)

And the verses of Surah Asra,17, (also called Surah Bani Israel) i.e. verses 73-75, in which as per the story the Holy Prophet was admonished, were obviously revealed after the incident of Mir'aj (Ascension to the Heavens) that took place in the 12th year after the Prophetic Call. (Maududi's Introduction to Surah 17)

And the verses of Surah al-Hajj (22:52) mentioned in the story wherein as it says the Holy Prophet (PBUH) was consoled later, were revealed in the first year after Hijrah. (Maududi's Introduction to Surah 22)

Now if we believe this whole account then it means that Holy Prophet (PBUH)-God Forbid-praised and worshiped the idols and so did his companions in 5th year of the prophetic Call and they were admonished some 6 years later in the year 12th year of the prophetic call and when Holy Prophet (PBUH) felt sorry for all this he was consoled again some two and half years later in the 1st year of Hijrah. Can anything be more ridiculous then this? Is it anyway possible?
And interestingly we don't find any other such incident in which Holy Prophet (PBUH) or his companions ever uttered even a single soft word for the pagans or their deities before being admonished by ALLAH 6 years later. Do you remember what you read right in the beginning?

Just in case you don't remember again see, Imam Tabari wrote;

"Hence, if I mention in this book a report about some men of the past, which the reader of listener finds objectionable or worthy of censure because he can see no aspect of truth nor any factual substance therein, let him know that this is not to be attributed to us but to those who transmitted it to us and we have merely passed this on as it has been passed on to us."

4-What really happened and how the story got narrated?

Actually what happened was only what is recorded in Authentic Hadith books like Bukhari etc. where we read;

Narrated Ibn Abbas: The Prophet (pbuh) prostrated while reciting An-Najm and with him prostrated

the Muslims, the pagans, the jinn, and all human beings. (Bukhari, Hadith 1009)

Infact it was the eloquence and beauty of the Qur'an depicting its Divine Origin that made the pagans of Makkah to spontaneously fall down in prostration, on hearing the last verse of Surah 53.

"But fall ye down in prostration to Allah, and adore (Him)!"

The Holy Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) and his companions prostrated as they were commanded so in the verse.

After the incident took place the Quraish later realized what they had done by prostrating on hearing the Glorious Qur'an. Now to hide their 'guilt' they concocted this story that Muhammad infact spoke something in favour of their deities and thus they agreed to make a patch-up. This was a really hypocrisy and sham that has been unveiled through internal and external examination of this fabricated story.

5-<u>Further Criticism</u>:

All these points are so strong and quieting that we need not to look for the reliability of its narrators as this cant be true in any case no matter how strong the chain of narrators may be. But only to give another blow to already fragile references of Christians who use this story let us have a look on the opinions of great scholars about its line of transmission;

Ibn Kathir said; 'All the links of this Tradition are unauthentic and I have found no correct version of this with continuous links.' (Ibn Kathir in his Tafsir 5/441-442)

Shaukani says, 'There is nothing true in it and none of its links is proved.' (Fath al-Qadeer 5/128)

Ibn Jawzi says: 'This is not correct.' (Zaad al-Muyassar 4/391)

When Ibn Khuzaimah was asked about it, he said, "This story has been invented by heretics". (Tafsir al-Raazi 11/134)

Baihaqi said; "This story has not been proved to be correct by the rules of reporting". (Tafsir a-Raazi 11/135)

Qazi `Ayad says, "The very fact that this tradition is neither contained in any of the authentic collections of Hadith nor has it been related in an authentic way by authentic reporters shows its weakness". (Al-Shifa 2/125)

Besides them, Imam Razi (in his Tafsir 11/135), Qazi Abu Bakr Ibn al-`Arabi (Al-Shifa 2/126), Alusi (in his Tafsir 13/99) etc. have rejected it altogether.

6-<u>On the other two verses in the story</u>:

Now some one may say that why than in other two verses Prophet Muhammad has been reproved and then later given a sort of consolation? Let us examine the other two verses as well so that we chase the evil to its utter helplessness.

According to the story Holy prophet was given a reproof in Surah 17 verses 73-75. The verses are;
"And their purpose was to tempt thee away from that which We had revealed unto thee, to substitute in our name something quite different; (in that case), behold! they would certainly have made thee (their) friend! And had We not given thee strength, thou wouldst nearly have inclined to them a little. In that

case We should have made thee taste an equal portion (of punishment) in this life, and an equal portion in death: and moreover thou wouldst have found none to help thee against Us!" (Al-Qur'an 17:73-75)

This simply refers to the fact that the Quraish tried to tempt the Holy Prophet with worldly things so that he may become some what soft towards their disbelief just as they tried it when they send their delegation to his uncle Abi Talib but infact got the most resolute answer that;

"Even if they put Sun on my right hand and Moon on the left I'll not renounce my Message."

Then Allah tells him that the resolution shown on your part was also granted by ALLAH. And if you had fallen into their trap you would have erred and given a severe reproof. Now what most important here is "And had We not given thee strength thou wouldst nearly have inclined to them a little." This part of the verse explicitly rules out the notion that he anytime actually fell into their trap. This is plain enough to understand that with ALLAH's help never did he yield to any temptation and he was able to remain firm only with ALLAH's help who is the Greatest and the Most Glorious. This verse has indeed nothing to do with this fabricated story.

Further the fabricated story says that having being reproved the Holy Prophet was much grieved and sad and was later somewhat consoled by ALLAH Almighty in the following words of Surah Hajj;

"Never did We send a messenger or a prophet before thee, but, when he framed a desire, Satan threw some (vanity) into his desire: but Allah will cancel anything (vain) that Satan throws in, and Allah will confirm (and establish) His Signs: for Allah is full of Knowledge and Wisdom:" (Al-Qur'an 22:52)

The Significant Arabic word here is "*Tamanna*" about which eminent scholar Maulana Maududi writes in his commentary Tafhim-ul-Qur'an;

"The Arabic word '*tamanna*' has two meanings: "desire" and "to recite" something. If the first meaning is taken, it will imply: "Satan tried to prevent the fulfillment of his desire." If the second meaning is taken, it will imply: "When the Prophet recited the Revelations, Satan created different sorts of doubts about its truth and meanings in the minds of the people." If the first meaning is adopted, it will imply: "Allah fulfils the Prophet's desire and makes his Mission successful in spite of the obstacles of Satan and confirms the truth of His Revelations by fulfilling His promises to the Prophet". In case of the second meaning, it will imply: "Allah eradicates all the doubts and objections inspired by Satan in the hearts of the people and clarifies the confusion created about any verse of the Qur'an in subsequent Revelations".

This again proves that this verse also has no special relation with the story in question.

7-<u>Conclusion</u>:

All these above points prove that the story is absolutely baseless and fabricated. Some earlier people did put into writing but they did subject its acceptance to rational examination & internal and external criticism which as we have seen prove its being fabricated & baseless.

8-<u>Why Christians refer to such baseless traditions</u>:

Actually the fact is that Christians try to prove that Jesus (peace be upon him) is God Incarnate. When they can't do so even from their own book of authority, the Bible, they get frustrated. And ever-increasing number of reverts to Islam and homage paid to the Holy Prophet (PBUH) & Islam by some of their people frustrates them further. Then in order to deviate the attention of people and in vain attempts to get rid of their frustration they

start speaking and yelling obscenities against the Holy Prophet (PBUH) and Islam and while doing so they use such baseless and dirty arguments which only proves that they are Devil Incarnates.

Counter Questions for Christians

We Muslims believe Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) to be Last & Final Messenger & Prophet of ALLAH. What these Christians are trying to do is to refute his status as Prophet of God by referring to such baseless stories. (I'll wish if someday some Christian ventures to argue me on this further).

Now let us make a counter argument;

Christians believe that Jesus (Peace be upon him) was God, a Divine Being. Now in the Bible we read that;

"Then was Jesus led up of the Spirit into the wilderness to be tempted of the devil." (Matthew 4:1) & **"Being forty days tempted of the devil."** (Luke 4:2)

Though he didn't fall into the trap of the Devil but he was tempted. No Christian can challenge this for it is in his own book of Authority. We Muslims don't even say this. Its Bible. And about God we know that Bible says;

"God cannot be tempted with evil." (James 1:13)

Now reading these three verses makes it clear that even according to the Bible Jesus (peace be upon him) is not God for God cannot be tempted with evil and Jesus was, according to the gospels, tempted of evil.

Remember Jesus (PBUH) said; **"And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free."** (John 8:32)

The fact is that it is Bible which refutes elementary Christian beliefs.

6- Does anyone other than Allah know the time of rain and as to what is in the womb?

Qur’an 31:34 says that none but ALLAH Alone knows certain things including 'time of rain' and 'what is in the wombs?' while today with the help of modern science we can predict rain and also the gender of the child in the womb. So, isn't this a scientific error of Qur’an?

This question is often raised by non-Muslims and many Muslims also do have this query about the last verse of Surah (i.e. chapter) 31 of the Holy Qur’an.

The verse is;

"Surely Allah is He with Whom is the knowledge of the hour, and He sends down the rain and He knows what is in the wombs; and no one knows what he shall earn on the morrow; and no one knows in what land he shall die; surely Allah is Knowing, Aware". (Qur’an 31:34)

The point that is raised is that verse says that its only ALLAH who knows all these things i.e**.1)** about the Hour, **2)** rain, **3)** what is in the wombs, **4)** what shall one earn the next day and **5)** about the land of his death.

But today we know that it can be known about the rain as to when it will fall and about the gender of the child in the womb. Is this not an error of the Qur’an?

My response:

Let's have a deep look into the wording of the verse and the point that is raised.

"Surely Allah is He with Whom is the knowledge of the hour, and He sends down the rain and He knows what is in the wombs; and no one knows what he shall earn on the morrow; and no one knows in what land he shall die; surely Allah is Knowing, Aware". (Qur’an Surah 31 ayah 34)

1- A deep look into the wording:

If one carefully analyzes and reflects on the wording of the verse than one can surely find out the truth.

One can clearly see that about three things 1) knowledge of the Last Hour 2) what one shall earn the next day and 3) about the land of one's death, the wording gives the connotation of exclusiveness that none but ALLAH alone knows these things. In Arabic this nuance is called *'Hasr'* while this is not found in the case of **1)** rain and **2)** what is in the wombs. That is to say that knowledge of **1)** Last Hour **2)** next day's earning and **3)** land of one's demise, being with anyone other than ALLAH has been exclusively ruled out.

In case of the knowledge of the Hour the Arabic words ‘*inna*’ and ‘*indahu*’ in combination give the exclusive sense. And knowledge of next day's earning and what is in the wombs is plainly and exclusively ruled out saying "no one knows..."

But this is not the case with other two things. As to rain the verse only says; "He sends down the rain" i.e. only a piece of information is given. And no-one can say as to when it will rain with absolute certainty, this is the reason many times the forecasts have errors.

About 'what is in the womb' the verse says "He knows what is in the wombs." Here we don’t find the connotation of 'exclusiveness' and further the verse says "what is in the wombs" which does not necessarily mean the gender. Who knows, what is the character of the child in the womb? Of course no-one!

2- Further clarification:

Now one may point to the Ahadith like the one below;

Narrated Ibn Umar: The Prophet said, **"The keys of the unseen are five and none knows them but Allah: (1) None knows what is in the womb, but Allah: (2) None knows what will happen tomorrow, but Allah; (3) None knows when it will rain, but Allah; (4) None knows where he will die, but Allah (knows that); (5) and none knows when the Hour will be established, but Allah."**
(Bukhari, Hadith 4328)

Here it is said **"None knows what is in the womb, but Allah:"** & **"None knows when it will rain, but Allah;"**

We see that there are many Ahadith that say the same. And from other narrations we come to know that when Holy Prophet (PBUH) pointed to the "five keys of the unseen" he referred to al-Qur'an 31:34 e.g.

Narrated Abdullah bin Umar: The Prophet said, **"The keys of the Unseen are five." And then he recited: Verily, the knowledge of the Hour is with Allah (alone)...' (31.34)**
(Bukhari, Hadith 4405)

3- Knowledge of rain timing and weather forecasting:

Yes, its Allah Alone who knows with utmost surety as to when will it rain. Today we can make forecasts but they are subject to all sorts of errors and infact prone to.

There are many errors in the forecasts. We can even observe in daily life. It happens, none can deny. Even in future the possibility of error will increase further. Following is derived from **Klaus Weickmann, Jeff Whitaker, Andres Roubicek and Catherine Smith paper, '*The Use of Ensemble Forecasts to Produce Improved Medium Range (3-15 days) Weather Forecasts*.';**

'Although a forecast model will predict weather features evolving realistically into the distant future, the errors in a forecast will inevitably grow with time due to the chaotic nature of the atmosphere and the inexactness of the initial observations. The detail that can be given in a forecast therefore decreases with time as these errors increase. There becomes a point when the errors are so large that the forecast has no correlation with the actual state of the atmosphere.'

4- Modern Science and the knowledge of 'what' is in the womb?

As I said earlier the verse says 'What is in the wombs?' which includes even the character and other details of ones personality and not merely the gender of the child.

And even the Hadith uses the words 'What is in the wombs?'

Thus there is no contradiction of either Qur'an or the Hadith with the modern science.

5- Recall the exclusive or not connotation part:

Here please recall the two connotations we discussed earlier that in case of Rain and 'What' is in the wombs?' there is no connotation of exclusiveness while it is there in case of other three things.

And what all I mentioned under the heading 'Further Clarification' shows the wisdom behind the difference. In case of 'rain' and 'what is in the wombs?' to a only a certain level man can know things that's why it has not been mentioned exclusively in that verse. But its absolutely impossible for man to know other three things so it has been exclusively declared that none but ALLAH Alone knows those.

7- Why Qur’an uses masculine pronouns for Allah?

Some people raise the question as to why Muslims refer to Allah with masculine pronouns when they say He has no gender and is not like unto anyone.

In order to understand the whole idea, please consider the following points:

1- Natural and Grammatical genders:

There are two kinds of gender; **1)** Natural (*Haqeeqi*), related to one’s biological bearing and **2)** Grammatical (*Majazi*) considering their usage in the language.

These two kinds of genders are found in many languages but more especially in Arabic. Ibn Sida in his classical Arabic grammar book quotes Al-Farisi as saying:

‘There are two kinds of femininity: femininity of meaning and femininity of wording.’ (Al-Mukhassas 4/135)

And obviously the same goes for masculinity.

In Arabic Sun is feminine and Moon is masculine, surely they have no gender but that’s what their etymological form makes of them.

Even **in English** states and ships are referred to with feminine pronouns. This fact does not assign them a de facto gender as in humans and animals.

2- Arabic has no neutral gender:

An important point we need to keep in my mind is that Arabic has no neutral gender so there is nothing like ‘it’ in Arabic. Everything is referred to using either masculine or feminine pronouns.

'Allah' cannot be feminine according to rules of Arabic:

Infact the make up of the word ‘Allah’ is such that it cannot be feminine for;

1- A word is feminine in Arabic if it is so by nature like e.g. ‘*umm’* i.e. ‘mother’ but obviously Allah is not feminine by nature.

2- A word is feminine if it ends with the third of the Arabic alphabets i.e. *taa* like in ‘*maruhat*’ i.e. fan. This is not the case with the word Allah.

3- A word is feminine if it ends with *Alif Mamduda* and indeed this also is not the case with the word ‘Allah’.

4- Something can be feminine if it happens to be in pairs like ‘*aynain*’ i.e. eyes or ‘*yadain*’ i.e. hands. Certainly this is not the case with the word ‘Allah’.

These points clarify that the make up of the word Allah does not allow referring to it with feminine pronouns.

3- Masculinity generally denotes Majesty:

If one asks why use masculine pronoun for Allah and not feminine then the answer is that generally masculinity represents Majesty and femininity denotes meekness and softness. And as the primary relation of man with Allah is that of a humble servant to his lord so the masculine pronouns suit more the Divine Majesty.

4- Last word:

Masculine pronouns used for Allah do not give any anthropomorphic sense because it is normal at least considering the Arabic language convention. And it, we may say, denotes the Divine Majesty.

8- Why Qur’an calls Mary sister of Aaron?

The verse in question is;

"O sister of Aaron! Thy father was not a man of evil, nor thy mother a woman unchaste!" (Al-Qur’an 19:28)

It does not mean that here Qur’an calls Mary, the real sister of Aaron, the Prophet who was hundreds of years before her. Here she is only being called a female person of the family, from the Noble lineage of Prophet Aaron.

1- The Qur’anic usage:

In order to understand Qur’anic language one must look into other Qur’anic passages.

Qur’ans calls Prophet Shoaib as the brother of the people of Midian. Qur’an says;

“And unto Midian (We sent) their brother, Shu'eyb." (Al-Qur’an 7:85)

And similarly Qur’an calls Prophet Salih, the brother of the people of Thamud. It says;

"And unto Thamud (We sent) their brother Salih." (Al-Qur’an 11:61)

In both these examples it is never meant that the Prophets were the *real* brothers of the each and every person of that tribe. Nay! It’s only way to address them. It means that Shu'aib was a (male) person from the people of Midian and similarly Salih from the people of Thamud.

So in the very same manner when Qur'an describes Mary, the mother of Christ as 'Sister of Aaron', It means that she is being referred to as a (female) person from the people, the lineage of Prophet Aaron.

This is infact an Arabic idiom, a way to address. In Arabia a person from the tribe *Banu Mudhar* may be addressed as *Ya Akha Mudhar*, meaning 'O the brother of Mudhar'.

2- <u>The Prophetic answer to this question</u>:

Mughira b. Shu'ba reported: **When I came to Najran, they (the Christians of Najran) asked me: You read" O sister of Aaron", whereas Moses was born much before Jesus. When I came back to Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) I asked him about that, whereupon he said: "The (people of the old age) used to call names (of their persons) after the names of the Prophets and pious persons who had gone before them."** (Sahih Muslim, *Book on General Behaviour*, Hadith 3962)

The Holy Prophet (PBUH) meant to say that Mary's relationship with Prophet Aaron was mentioned because she was of his lineage for among Semites it was common to associate a person with his lineage.

This fits the context as well. The people thought that Mary had done something unworthy of a chaste woman and thus as they rebuked her, they first made a reference to her noble ancestry and then testified that even her own father was no wicked person (verse 28).

3- <u>Observations from the Bible</u>:

1- One thing we need to consider is that Qur'an does not call Mary 'Sister of Moses' but 'Sister of Aaron'.

2- Aaron (PBUH) we know was the first in line for the Israelite priesthood.

3- New Testament clearly tells us that Elizabeth, the mother of John the Baptist (PBUH) was from the lineage of Aaron (Luke 1:5). Also it tells that Mary was a cousin of Elizabeth (1:36). Therefore we can easily call them both 'Sisters of Aaron' i.e. from the lineage of Aaron.

4- Infact we have evidence of the similar usage from the Bible. In Genesis 13:8 Abraham and Lot are called brothers while certainly they did not come from loins of one individual. It reads;

"And Abram said unto Lot, Let there be no strife, I pray thee, between me and thee, and between my herdmen and thy herdmen; for we be brethren."

A certain Christian commentator, Adam Clarke says in his commentary to this verse;

'[It means] we are of the same family, worship the same God in the same way, have the same promises, and look for the same end.'

Was the same not true in case of Mary and Aaron? Were they both not from the same priestly family and of same faith?

Infact it's only a beautiful way of expression in the Semitic languages and to try to twist it some other way speaks only of ones inner wickedness and that's all!

9- Does Qur'an err in describing the Christian concept of God?

Christians often allege that Quran condemns ideas in Christian conception of God which are hypothetical and untrue, thus they try to find fault with the Quran. In the following lines we explain various Quranic verses condemning such ideas and their context and rationale.

There are a few verses in the Quran refuting various heretical Christian concepts of God. All of them should be taken as they are without making any assumed connections between them.

1- Qur'anic verses condemning Christian concepts of God:

"O People of the Book! Commit no excesses in your religion: Nor say of Allah aught but the truth. Christ Jesus the son of Mary was (no more than) a messenger of Allah, and His Word, which He bestowed on Mary, and a spirit proceeding from Him: so believe in Allah and His messengers. Say not "Trinity" : desist: it will be better for you: for Allah is one Allah: Glory be to Him: (far exalted is He) above having a son. To Him belong all things in the heavens and on earth. And enough is Allah as a Disposer of affairs." (Quran 4:171)

This verse condemns the common Christian concept of Trinity.

"In blasphemy indeed are those that say that Allah is Christ the son of Mary." (Quran 5:17, 72)

This verse condemns the belief held by Jecobites, the followers of Jacob Baradaeus, that Christ is 'perfect god' along with being perfect man.

"And behold! Allah will say: 'O Jesus the son of Mary! Didst thou say unto men, worship me and my mother as gods in derogation of Allah'?" (Quran 5:116)

First of all there is nothing in the context that relates the idea of Mary taken as God to Trinity. This passage no way defines and points to the definition of Trinity. It only condemns the idea of Mary as God.

Christians say that this is not a valid argument as Christians don't consider Mary to God, but the fact remains that such ideas have been held by certain denominations and groups. Infact some even took Virgin Mary to be a part of their 'Holy Trinity'.

2- Mary as God among Christians:

George Sale in his Preliminary Discourse on Quran mentions a certain group named Collyridians that had origins in Arabia who introduced the Virgin Mary as God. He writes;

"Among the Arabs …the Collyridians …introduced the Virgin Mary for God, or worshipped her as such, offering her a sort of twisted cake called collyris, whence the sect had its name."

He continues;

'This notion of the divinity of the Virgin Mary was also believed by some at the Council of Nicaea, who said there were two gods besides the Father, viz., Christ and the Virgin Mary, and were thence named Mariamites.' (*Preliminary Discourse*, Section II, Quran vol.1)

Similarly John William Draper writes;

"…the Marionites regarded the Trinity as consisting of God the Father, God the Son, and God the Virgin Mary; the Collyridians worshiped the Virgin as a divinity, offering her sacrifices of cakes;" (*History of the Conflict between Religion and Science*, Chapter 3)

Classical Muslim scholar Ibn Hazm also mentions a sect *Al-Barbarania* who believed in Jesus (PBUH) and his Mother as God. (Al-Milal wal-Nahl 1/27)

All these facts establish the solid basis on which Qur'an condemns the notion of taking Virgin Mary as God!

10- Does Allah practice deceit and guile according to Qur'an?

Many known anti-Islamic polemicists like the shameless Sham Shamoun say that according to Qur'an Allah is a master deceiver who practices deceit and guile. They refer to the Qur'anic verses in the words '*makr'*, '*kayd*' and '*khid"* have been used.

In the following lines we discuss the true meanings of both the words and unveil the lie of these islamophobes.

1- The word '*makr*' used for Allah:

"And they planned and Allah (also) planned (*yamkurullah*), and Allah is the best of planners." (Qur'an 8:30)

"What! do they then feel secure from Allah's plan (*makr-ullah*)? But none feels secure from Allah's plan (*makr-ullah*)? except the people who shall perish." (Qur'an 7:99)

"And they planned a plan, and We planned a plan (*makarna makran*) while they perceived not." (Qur'an 27:50)

2- Meaning of '*makr*' according to Muslim lexicographers:

Raghib Isfahani, the well known classical Qur'anic lexicographer writes about the word '*makr*' that it is used to denote a plan and strategy and has two connotation, the good and the evil. (Mufradaat Al-Qur'an 1/471)

3- Meaning of 'makr' according to Edward Lane's lexicon:

These cunning missionaries refer to Lane's lexicon but then hide part of what he wrote. While they quote him to have written that *makr* means 'deceit, guile or circumvention' they forget to mention that Edward Lane also writes;

> art. خدع. — مكر also signifies *He managed with thought, or consideration, or acted with policy, and practised stratagem, in war.* (TA.)

And he further elaborates;

> TA :*) or مكر الله signifies *God's granting a man respite or delay, and enabling him to accomplish his worldly aims [so as to bring upon himself the punishment due to his evil actions]*: (Er-Rághib, TA :) or, accord. to IAth, *God's causing his trials to befall his enemies, exclusively of his friends:* or *his taking men by little and little, so that they do not reckon upon it, bestowing upon them renewed favours for acts of obedience which are imagined to be accepted whereas they are rejected.* (TA.)

See Edward William Lane's Arabic English Lexicon Part 7 p.256

4- <u>'*Makr*' itself does not have the connotation of evil in it</u>:

It becomes evident from the above testimonies that the Arabic word '*makr*' means a plan and strategy which may be good or evil. This is clarified beyond all doubt from its following Qur'anic usage;

"(In) behaving proudly in the land and in planning evil (*makr as-sayy*); and the evil plans (*makr as-sayy*) shall not beset any save the authors of it. Then should they wait for aught except the way of the former people?" (Qur'an 35:43)

Here Qur'an says *'makr as-sayy'* which means 'evil plan'. And it is the word '*al-sayy'* which means 'evil'. Now the point to note is that if the word '*makr'* by itself has the connotation of evil in it then why use the word 'evil' with it separately? Those who know even the modicum of linguistics understand well that this example is a categorical proof that '*makr*' intrinsically does not give the nuance of evil.

5- <u>The word '*makr*' and Holy Prophet's (PBUH) prayer</u>:

Continuing with the lies against Islam these people then quote a prayer of the Holy Prophet (PBUH) in which he prayed to Allah to plan for him and not against him using the word '*makr*' for planning. They prayer is recorded both in Jami' Tirmidhi and Tafsir Qurtubi. Wording in Jami' Tirmidhi is;

"My Lord, help me but do not help against me. Give me victory but not give victory over me. Plan for me and do not plan against me." (Jami' Tirmidhi, Book of Supplications, Hadith 3562. Also see Tafsir Qurtubi 4/99)

Considering the above details about the meaning of '*makr*' and the rest of the wording of the prayers the meaning becomes clear. The Holy Prophet (PBUH) as a humble servant of Allah prayed to Him to seek His help and thus taught his followers the right conduct.

The Prophet (PBUH) prayed to be helped and not helped against, to be granted victory and not granted victory over and to be planned for and not planned against. Just as help *(a'anah*) and being given victory (*nusrah*) are not evil by themselves neither is planning. It is the purpose and aim which makes something evil. And planning against wrong-doers is indeed good and that is what Allah does. And by this prayer all that Prophet (PBUH) intended was to beseech Allah to keep him guided to the straight path and thus to be saved from His planning against him.

The meaning is simply that one should always remember that he is dependant on Allah the disposition of all the affairs of life.

6- The word '*kayd*' used for Allah:

"I give them respite. Surely My plan (*kaydi*) is firm." (Qur'an 7:183 & 68:45)

"They are devising plans, and I Am devising plans *(akidu kayda)."* (Qur'an 86:15-16)

7- Meaning of '*kayd*' according to Muslim lexicographers:

Raghib Isfahani in his monumental work Mufradaat Al-Qur'an writes against the word '*kayd*' that it refers to using secret means and has both praiseworthy and condemnable connotation based on the ends aimed to be met. (Mufradaat Al-Qur'an 1/443)

8- Meaning of '*kayd*' according to Edward Lane's lexicon:

One again the Liars refer to Lane's lexicon but spill out the half truth which is as good as a lie. E.W. Lane writes about the word '*kayd*';

inf. n. كَيْد, *He practised an evasion or elusion, a shift, a wile, an artifice, or artful contrivance or device, a plot, a stratagem, or an expedient; or he exercised art, artifice, cunning, ingenuity, or skill, in the management or ordering of affairs,, with excellent consideration or delibera-tion, and ability to manage with subtilty according to his own free will;* syn. اِحْتَالَ; (L:) and

And further elaborating the meaning of the word when used for Allah Lane writes;

an artful device]. كَيْدُ ٱللّٰهِ لِلْكُفَّارِ [*God's practising an artful device towards the unbelievers*] means his taking them unawares, so that they do not reckon upon it; bestowing upon them enjoyments in which they delight, and on which they place their reliance, and with which they become familiar so as not to be mindful of death, and then taking them in their most heedless state; إِسْتِدْرَاجُهُمْ مِنْ حَيْثُ لَا يَعْلَمُونَ. (Zj,

See Edward William Lane's Arabic English Lexicon Part 7 p.167

So when *kayd* is used with reference to Allah it merely refers to His planning the affairs with wisdom which is indeed true for each of His deeds.

9- The word *khid'a* used for Allah:

Khid'a is another word used for Allah which the insane souls yell about and say that it means Allah practices deceit and guile. Here are the verses in which the word is used for the Almighty.

"Surely, the hypocrites (try to) deceive Allah while He is the One who leaves them in deception (*khadi'uhum*)." (Qur'an 4:142)

10- Meaning of *khid'a* according to Muslim lexicographers:

Once again let me quote Raghib Isfahani to clarify the true meaning of this word;

"He made him to resign, or relinquish, the object he had in view, by pretending to him something contrary to what he intended." (Mufradaat Al-Qur'an 1/143)

11- Meaning of *khid'a* according to Edward Lane's lexicon:

Infact Lane also quotes the same in his lexicon part 2 p.345. And before it he says that the basic meaning of Khid'a is to hide and conceal.

12- All the three word are in essence same:

All three words, makr, kayd and khid'a are all in essence same and when used for Allah signify His getting the evil mongers unaware of the outcome of their deeds after they have stubbornly rejected the Truth.
One thing is common in the usage of all these words with reference to Allah that they signify His planning for the good and against the evil i.e. punishment of the criminals. And as to the question about His taking them unaware without their reckoning it, the following two verses are enough for the understanding of the unprejudiced souls. Allah says in the Qur'an;

"If anyone contends with the Messenger even after guidance has been plainly conveyed to him, and follows a path other than that becoming to men of Faith, *We shall leave him in the path he has chosen, and land him in Hell,*- what an evil refuge!" (Qur'an 4:115)

"We (too) shall turn to (confusion) their hearts and their eyes, even as they refused to believe in this in the first instance: *We shall leave them in their trespasses*, to wander in distraction." (Qur'an 6:110)

So the makr, kayd and khid'a of Allah for the transgressors is His leaving them to what the choose for themselves and let them find their destruction while all this period they vainly think they have outplayed the Divine forces.

ANSWERS TO LIES ABOUT THE HOLY PROPHET (PBUH):

1- Why was the Prophet polygamous?

Non-Muslims often ask as to why Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) had more wives at one time than what is allowed for common Muslim i.e. four at a time. Some of them even yell obscenities alleging that these were sensual passions that made the Prophet (PBUH) polygamous.

For the complete understanding of the issue, consider the following points;

1- Certain things were specific for the Holy Prophet (PBUH) only:

Let it be clear that this was not the only thing peculiar to the Holy Prophet, infact there were many. For instance, as we Muslims believe that Prayers at Late Night (*Tahajjud*) is a great deed of piety, still for us, common Muslims, it is not obligatory. But it was obligatory for the Holy Prophet (PBUH) (cf. Qur'an 17:79, 73:2-4). And it is really demanding to get out of bed and offer Late Night (*Tahajjud*) prayers and that too regularly not missing without a genuine reason. This is only to refute the notion that Holy Prophet (PBUH)-God forbid!- himself created some exceptions for himself.

2- Holy Prophet (PBUH) didn't marry out of his physical desires!

He did not marry more women out of his physical desires for he had only one wife even till the age of 54. Till 50 he had only one wife Sayyidah Khadija who was 15 years elder to him and was twice widowed before. And for next 4 years his only wife was Sayyida Sawda, also an aged lady. All, but one, of his wives were either widows or divorced. It was only at the age of 55 that four wives gathered in his marriage.

John Bagot Glubb admits this fact in the following words;

"It is, however, worthy to note that of all his wives, only Aisha was a virgin when he married her. Zainab bint Jahash was a divorced wife and all the rest were widows, some of them, it would seem, not particularly attractive. Moreover the Apostle had married Khadija when he was twenty-five and she was a widow considerably older than he was. He had remained completely faithful to her for twenty-four years until her death." (The Life and Times of Muhammad p.237, pub. Stein And Day, New York, 1971)

Further he says;

"In Medina, Muhammad had less and less leisure time and must often have been mentally and physically exhausted, especially as he was in his fifties and latterly over sixty. These are not the circumstances under which men are interested in the indulgence of extreme sexuality.

The assumption that he was a sensualist because he had eleven wives when he died at the age of sixty-two is therefore not absolutely a foregone conclusion, as many have assumed. This is particularly so in view of the fact that he had only one wife until he was fifty." (p.239)

All this belies the notion that the Last Prophet of Islam (PBUH) married multiple time for of his physical desires. John Davenport asks a valid question;

“.. and it may then be asked, is it likely that a very sensual man, of a country where polygamy was a common practice, should be contented for five-and-twenty years with one wife, she being fifteen years older than himself;[?]” (An Apology for Muhammed and the Koran p.26 pub. J. Davy and Sons, London)

Stanely Lane Poole also writes;

“… to say that Mohammad was a voluptuary is false. The simple austerity of his daily life, to the very last, his hard mat for sleeping on, his plain food, his self-imposed menial work, point him out as an ascetic rather than a voluptuary.” (Studies in a Mosque p.77, pub. W. H. Allen & Co. London, 1883)

Another European, Thomas Carlyle, commented on this oft-repeated lie about the Prophet (PBUH);

“Mahomet himself, after all that can be said about him, was not a sensual man. We shall err widely if we consider this man as a common voluptuary, intent mainly on base enjoyments, — nay on enjoyments of any kind.” (On Heroes, Hero-Worship, and the Heroic in History p.65 Lecture II, pub. Champan and Hall, London, 1840)

3- Wisdom behind his marriages:

All his marriages had great wisdom behind them. His plural marriages were to practically show all sorts of permissible marriages in Islam and had extra-ordinary political benefits for the nascent Muslim community.

1-His marriage with Khadija (RA) shows that it is permissible for a person who is bachelor to marry a widow, to marry a woman who is older than him, for a (relatively) poor and orphan man to marry a rich woman, for an employee to marry his employer. His relation with Khadija (RA) was a perfect show of mutual trust and fidelity. The very fact that Prophet (PBUH) did not marry during her lifetime belies all the charges of sensuality. Some jaundiced-eyed critics went on to say that it were only Prophet’s (PBUH) financial constraints that kept him away from marrying further during Khadija’s (RA) lifetime.

Stanely Lane Poole, himself a bitter critic of Islam, had to acknowledge the absurdity of such an assertion. He writes;

“An attempt has been made to explain away Mohammad's fidelity to Khadija, by adducing the motive of pecuniary prudence. Mohammad, they say, was a poor man, Khadija rich and powerfully connected; any *affaire de coeur* on the husband's part would have been followed by a divorce and the simultaneous loss of property and position. It is hardly necessary to point out that the fear of poverty — a matter of little consequence in Arabia and at that time — would not restrain a really sensual man for five-and- twenty years; especially when it is by no means certain that Khadija, who loved him with all her heart in a motherly sort of way, would have sought a divorce for any cause soever. And this explanation leaves Mohammad's loving remembrance of his old wife unaccounted for. If her money alone had curbed him for twenty-five years, one would expect him at her death to throw off the cloak, thank Heaven for the deliverance, and enter at once upon the rake's progress. He does none of those things.” (Studies in a Mosque p.79, pub. W. H. Allen & Co. London, 1883)

2-His marriage to Sawdah bint Zama'a (RA) shows that a widower can opt to marry a middle-aged, kind, jolly and widowed woman who can take care of his children. It was perhaps imperative for the Prophet (PBUH) to marry a lady of her age for then he needed someone to look after his children.

3-He married young and intelligent ‘Aisha bint Abu Bakr (RA) so that she remembers and continues to teach

the masses all matters relating to married life and even the rest. This marriage also aimed at fostering his friendly relations with Abu Bakr (RA) and also to refute the baseless Arab tradition of not marrying the daughter of the called-not real brother. It was also a practical manifestation that one can marry a virgin.

4-He married Hafsa (RA), the daughter of ‘Umar (RA) to foster better relations with his important companion.

5- His marriage with Zainab bint Khuzaima (RA), widow of ‘Ubaida (RA) who fell as a martyr in the Battle of Badr, showed his care for the widows of the martyred and was a practical stimulus for Muslim men to be sensitive towards the situation of the widows of those martyred in the service of Islam.

6-He married Umm Habiba (RA), who was the daughter of the Chief of Makkah, Abu Sufyan. This marriage brought him closer to the Umayyads, an important family among the Quraish. This led to rather smooth and bloodless Conquest of Makkah. William Muir acknowledges this motive;

“[The Prophet] perhaps farther hoped to make Abu Sofian, the father of Omm Habiba, more favourible to his cause.” (The Life of Mahomet, vol. 4 p.59 pub. Smith, Elder and Co. London, 1861)

John Bagot Glubb (aka Glubb Pasha) also makes an interesting observation on the same lines;

“He took the trouble to write to the Emperor of Abyssinia to send him Umm Habeeba to be his bride. If his object had been merely to acquire another woman, there must have been hundreds of more attractive brides available in Arabia. Possibly he sent for Umm Habeeba as a bridge to establish relations with Abu Sofian who, he had noticed, was now adopting a more conciliatory attitude.” (The Life and Times of Muhammad p.304)

7-He married Umm Salamah (RA), his only wife who brought children from her previous marriage. Thus Holy Prophet gave a practical example to take care of children that a person’s wife has from some earlier marriage. This marriage pacified her tribe who were earlier very vehement in opposition of Islam as now they had a relation with the Holy Prophet (PBUH). This led many of that tribe to revise their thinking about Islam.

8-He married Zainab bint Jahsh (RA) to uproot the baseless Arab tradition of not marrying the divorcees of adopted-not-real sons. And also to practically show that one can marry his first degree cousin. She was his only wife who happened to be his cousin.

9- He married Juwairiya bint Al-Haritha (RA) to foster his relations with the important Jewish tribes and also to show that Islam allows mix marriages based on social status. These marriages also show the high regard in which women were held that instead of making them slaves, Holy Prophet (PBUH) married them and thus give them the high status of 'Mothers of the Believers' About the political benefits of this marriage, John Bagot Glubb in his aforementioned book writes;

“ … this was a purely political marriage, for it won over Beni Mustaliq to Islam more successfully than a battle.” (p.263)

10-His marriage with Safiyya bint Hayy (RA), daughter of the Nudair tribe of Jews, proved a great success in neutralizing the harsh sentiments of a considerable faction of the Jews in Northern Arabia.

Watt writes; **“There may have been political motives in the unions with the Jewesses Safiyah and Rayhana.”** (Muhammad at Medina p.288, pub. Oxford, 1956)

11- His marriage with Maimuna (RA) resulted in the some highly valuable people coming to Islam. In the words of Washington Irving;

"This was doubtless another marriage of policy, for Maimuna was fifty-one years of age, and a widow, but the connexion gained him two powerful proselytes. One was Khaled Ibn al Waled, a nephew of the widow, an intrepid warrior ... The Other proselyte was Khaled's friend Amrul Ibn al Aass;" (The Life of Mahomet p.183 pub. Bernhard Tachnitz, Leipzig 1850)

The fact that Prophet's (PBUH) marriages were for reasons other than alleged sensuality is acknowledged even by a prejudiced critics like D.S. Margoliouth. He wrote;

"In several of these marriages it is easy to see that political considerations were dominant." (Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, Article: Muhammad. vol. 8 p.879 pub. T. & T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1915)

Had Allah Almighty not allowed him to have plural marriages then many Muslims may not have got many benefits which they actually did. Many strong enemies might not have been pacified. Many matters of *Shariah* (Islamic Law) may not have been explained so well. These were only the Wives of the Holy Prophet (PBUH) who taught us matters relating to married life and other in-house affairs. Here one must remember that none of the Holy Prophet's male children lived to maturity and only one of his daughters, Fatimah (RA) lived after his death and that also only for 6 months. In such a situation it would have been virtually a calamity for the Muslim Ummah if Holy Prophet did not have these wives, as many teachings would have remained veiled from us in that case.

All the above details prove that his marriages were out of his physical desires but other motives undoubtedly noble and great atleast from the perspective of the Muslim community and as evident from their outcomes.

4- Biblical Prophets also had many wives, infact too many!

a- According to Bible, Abraham (PBUH) had three wives, Hagar (Gen. 16:4), Sarah (Gen. 11:29) and Ketura (Gen. 25:1)

b- Jacob (PBUH) had four wives, Leah (Gen. 29:23), Rachel (Gen. 29:28), Zilpah (Gen. 30:9) and Bilhah (Gen. 30:3)

c- Bible says about **Prophet David**;

"And David took him *more concubines and wives* out of Jerusalem, after he was come from Hebron: and there were yet sons and daughters born to David." (2 Samuel 5:13)

Reading 1Chronicles 3:1-9 makes it known that Prophet David had at least 6 wives and numerous concubines.

d- About Prophet Solomon it says;

"And he had *seven hundred wives*, princesses, and *three hundred concubines*: and his wives turned away his heart." (1 Kings 11:3)

See the list of polygamists in the Bible HERE.

Concluding words:

Infact all the marriages of the Holy Prophet (PBUH) had great wisdom behind them, not only for his own time but also for the times to come. It has great effect with regard to spiritual and social growth of the Muslim Ummah which is undoubtedly the best nation as far as sociality and family setup is concerned.

I wonder what trouble hounds Christians from recognizing the simple truth that Holy Prophet's (PBUH) were not for sensual reasons but other prudential reasons. If Martin Luther can say that;

"The polygamy of the patriarchs, Gideon, David, Solomon &c., was a matter of necessity, not of libertinism." (Table Talk, DCCXLII.p.304 Translated by William Hazlitt, Bell & Daldy, London 1872)

Why the same cannot be said of the marriages of Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) when even many of the die-hard critics also recognize the 'necessities' in those cases?

I am sure that only if our Christian fellows can put off the goggles of prejudice they would be able to see things in a much realistic and just manner.

2- Why Holy Prophet's (PBUH) married young 'Aisha (RA)?

The question of Holy Prophet's (PBUH) marriage with Sayyidah 'Aisha is the one hurled against Muslims in almost every discussion. And it takes much time for people to understand the whole issue only because they fail to understand historical things in their right perspective considering the situation in those particular times. Agreed that a Prophet's deeds should be above any question in all times and this is true indeed, but there are certain things in which change is inevitable subject to valid reasons and Holy Prophet's (PBUH) marriage with Sayyidah 'Aisha is one such case. One who fails to understand the times and all the factors related to issue in hand can never understand the happenings through the history.

1- Islamic Law regarding age of marriage:

In Islam there is no fixed age of marriage, whenever a person reaches the age of puberty he or she is fit for marriage. Nikah, the marital contract, may be made earlier but consummation of marriage can take place only after puberty is attained.

2- The age of maturity through the ages and over the regions:

The wisdom behind Islam not fixing an age is evident, different people reach the age of puberty at different times. And the general trend also varies over the time and across the regions with variant climate conditions. For instance, people living in regions of low altitudes attain puberty earlier then those in high altitudes regions. Similarly people in warm climates attain puberty earlier then those in cold climates. Now keeping all this in mind consider that when Holy Prophet (PBUH) married Sayyidah 'Aisha while she was nine it was some 1400 years back and it happened in Arabia, a region with relatively lower altitude and hot climate as one of its most salient features.

Leaving all the history aside, even now puberty at nine is no wonderful a phenomenon. Experts now suggest

that age 7 (even 6 for some races) and not 8 should be considered precocious (i.e. early) for puberty among girls. Below is a reference that a nine year old Thai girl even became a mother.


Thai officials shocked to hear of nine-year-old becoming a mother

3- Sayyidah ‘Aisha was fit for the marriage, considering the puberty factor and physical bearing:

It is rather erroneous to say that Sayyidah ‘Aisha (RA) was a child bride. She was a grown up girl.

Sayyidah ‘Aisha herself narrates; **‘Holy Prophet (PBUH) married her when she was six years old and consummated the marriage when she was nine years old…’** (Bukhari, Hadith 4738)

Having known this, let me draw your attention to another saying of Sayyidah ‘Aisha which Al-Tirmidhi has narrated under a Hadith in his collection’s Book of Marriage, Chapter 18. It goes as:

Sayyidah ‘Aisha said: ‘When a girl is nine years old, she is a woman (meaning, she has attained puberty).’ (Tirmidhi, Hadith 1109)

Moreover, through certain narrations we come to know of the fact she was going through her puberty. Modern science testifies that puberty causes hair loss and this is exactly what we read in a Hadith:

Narrated Sayyidah ‘Aisha: **“The Prophet engaged me when I was a girl of six (years). We went to Medina and stayed at the home of Bani-al-Harith bin Khazraj then I got ill and *my hair fell down*…”** (Bukhari Hadith 3605)

So this makes it absolutely clear that Sayyidah ‘Aisha’s marriage was consummated at an age, she herself says was that of puberty. The general tone of her statement also conveys that it was normal in those times and in that environment.

It also needs to be mentioned that even before the Holy Prophet (PBUH), she was engaged with Jubair bin Mut’am whose parents dissolved the engagement when her family embraced Islam.

All these details kill the argument that Holy Prophet (PBUH) had intimate marital relations with a child, for in that particular sense she was no more a child and she herself testifies that being a nine year old she was a woman then having attained puberty.

Moreover, she was quite healthy and fit. She herself says:

'My mother intended to make me fat to send me to the (house of) the Messenger of Allah (PBUH). But nothing which he desired benefited me till she gave me cucumber with fresh dates to eat. Then I became fat as good (as she desired).' (Abu Dawud, Hadith 3903)[1]

4- About Sayyidah 'Aisha playing with dolls etc:

Another issue concerning this marriage is the fact of Sayyidah 'Aisha playing with dolls and other toys. The question raised is that playing with toys is an innocent child act, and it proves that she was a child when she was married to the Holy Prophet (PBUH). This much is true but the point missed is that Holy Prophet (PBUH) did have an understanding of this fact and he did not expect or force her to behave like his other wives e.g. like aged Sayyidah Sawda (RA). Infact we find that Holy Prophet (PBUH) gave her ample chances to fulfill her desire of playing with her friends and made her feel comfortable.

Sayyidah 'Aisha narrates: **'I used to play with the dolls in the presence of the Prophet, and my girl friends also used to play with me. When Allah's Messenger used to enter (my dwelling place) they used to hide themselves, but the Prophet would call them to join and play with me.'** (Bukhari, Hadith 5665)

Sayyidah 'Aisha reported: **'By Allah, I remember the Messenger of Allah (PBUH) standing on the door of my apartment screening me with his mantle enabling me to see the sport of the Abyssinians as they played with their daggers in the mosque of the Messenger of Allah (PBUH). He (the Holy Prophet) kept standing for my sake till I was satiated and then I went back; and thus you can well imagine how long a girl tender of age who is fond of sports (could have watched it).'** (Muslim, Hadith 1481)

These two narrations show that Holy Prophet (PBUH) did care for the natural urge of his young wife for amusement. And this is also a proof that her marriage at the age of nine did not bar her from the enjoyment craved for at that age.

Holy Prophet (PBUH) consummated the marriage with Sayyidah 'Aisha when she was nine as she had attained puberty and, as she herself said that at nine a girl is rather a woman, but he did not burden her with tough responsibilities of a wife and provided her ample opportunities to enjoy her age.

This infact shows the wisdom of the Holy Prophet (PBUH) that he did present a role model for all the people to come to care for all the needs of a wife. She married women of all age groups, elder to him like Sayyidah Khadija (RA), of his own age like Sauda (RA), younger but mature of age like Zainab (RA) and much younger like Sayyidah 'Aisha (RA).

[1] Albani classified it as Sahih

5- Sayyidah ‘Aisha’s marriage and consent issue:

Next comes the issue of her consent. Her *nikah*, the marital contract, was made when she was six but the marriage was consummated when she was nine. Now had she showed her displeasure about this marriage when she was nine, and thus a woman according to her own testimony, then marriage would haven been null and void, but it never turned up like that. She did not show any such notion and similarly never in her later life did she ever give any such impression. She rather always showed her love for the Holy Prophet (PBUH).

6- Wisdom behind this marriage:

We know that Sayyidah ‘Aisha (RA) was considered the most learned among the all the Companions of the Holy Prophet (PBUH). The following testifies to this.

Abu Musa al-Ashari says: **"Never had we (the companions) any difficulty for the solution of which we approached ‘Aisha and did not get some useful information from her".** (Tirmidhi, Hadith 3883)[1]

She narrated some 2210 Ahadith from the Prophet (PBUH) and this was possible only because she lived with him for nine years and that too at a young age when people have a sharp memory and great sense of observation. Then she lived for about 46 years after the death of the Holy Prophet (PBUH) and continued to teach the people matters of religion especially those related to household affairs and marital life. No other wife of the Holy Prophet (PBUH) did the similar job that may be compared with her blessed endeavors. This shows the Divine Wisdom for it was not the Prophet himself but Allah that ordained this marriage. She herself reports;

Allah's Messenger (PBUH) said to me, ‘You were shown to me twice (in my dream) before I married you. I saw an angel carrying you in a silken piece of cloth, and I said to him, 'Uncover (her),' and behold, it was you.’ (Bukhari, Hadith 6495)

Thus do Allah’s plans work in a marvelous way!

3- Was Holy Prophet’s marriage with Safiya (RA) justified?

Holy Prophet’s (PBUH) marriage with Sayyidah Safiya is another topic that critics of Islam often take up. They say:

[1] Albani classified it as Sahih

1-Holy Prophet (PBUH) married a woman after killing her husband and father, so how could she be happy or even willing for it?

2-The rules of Iddah were violated in this marriage.

In the following lines we explain the whole issue in detail. Ahadith in Sahih Bukhari explain as to what actually happened.

We conquered Khaibar, took the captives, and the booty was collected. Dihya came and said, 'O Allah's Prophet! Give me a slave girl from the captives.' The Prophet said, 'Go and take any slave girl.' He took Safiya bint Huyai. A man came to the Prophet and said, 'O Allah's Messengers! You gave Safiya bint Huyai to Dihya and she is the chief mistress of the tribes of Quraiza and An-Nadir and she befits none but you.' So the Prophet said, 'Bring him along with her.' So Dihya came with her and when the Prophet saw her, he said to Dihya, 'Take any slave girl other than her from the captives.' Anas added: The Prophet then manumitted her and married her." Thabit asked Anas, "O Abu Hamza! What did the Prophet pay her (as Mahr)?" He said, "Her self (i.e. freedom) was her Mahr (dower) for he manumitted her and then married her." Anas added, "While on the way, Um Sulaim dressed her for marriage (ceremony) and at night she sent her as a bride to the Prophet. So the Prophet was a bridegroom and he said, 'Whoever has anything (food) should bring it.' He spread out a leather sheet (for the food) and some brought dates and others cooking butter. (I think he (Anas) mentioned As-SawTq). So they prepared a dish of Hais (a kind of meal). And that was Walima (the marriage banquet) of Allah's Messenger (PBUH)**."** (Bukhari, Hadith 358)

1- Were the rules of *Iddah* violated?

Following Hadith needs a careful reading;

Abu Sa'id Khudri narrated the following statement from Allah's Messenger (PBUH) **regarding the captives of Awtas: "There must be no intercourse with a pregnant woman till she gives birth, or with one who is not pregnant till she has had one menstrual period."** (Abu Dawud, Hadith 2157)1

This Hadith lays down a rule that a man is not allowed to have intimate relations with a captive woman till she is clean from menses. This is to avoid any confusion in the lineage.

Now considering the fact that Sayyidah Safiya was actually a captive woman who was then freed and married to by the Holy Prophet (PBUH), in the light of the above Hadith the Prophet (PBUH) was to wait for her being clean from a menstrual course before consummating the marriage and this is exactly what he did. We read in Sahih Bukhari:

Narrated Anas bin Malik: …**The Prophet selected her for himself, and set out with her, and when we reached a place called Sadd-as-Sahba', Safiya became clean from her menses then Allah's Messenger married her.** (Bukhari, Hadith 3889)

2- Was Sayyidah Safiya willing for the marriage?

---

[1] Albāni classified it as Sahih.

As to the question whether Sayyidah Safiya was willing for the marriage or not, no body's conjecture but her own words can make things clear. The following narration explains in detail.

When Safiya came to the Holy Prophet (PBUH) **he said to her; 'Among the Jews your father did not stop in his enmity towards me until Allah destroyed him.' She said: 'O Allah's Messenger! Indeed Allah says in His book, 'No one will take anyone else's burden'. So the Holy Prophet** (PBUH) **said to her: 'Make your choice, if you will chose Islam I'll select you for myself and if you chose Judaism, I'll set you free and send you to your people.' She said; 'O Allah's Messenger indeed I longed for Islam and testified for you even before you gave me this invitation when I came to you. I have no guardian among the Jews, neither father nor brother and I prefer Islam over disbelief. Allah and His Messenger are dear to me then freedom and to return to my people."** (Ibn Saad 8/123)

Lest one should doubt this narration as to how did Sayyidah Safiya know before embracing Islam that Allah says in His book '**No one will take anyone else's burden',** it needs to be clarified that even in the Jewish scriptures the same is mentioned e.g. in Ezekiel 18: 20 and it is comprehendible that she coming from a Jewish background knew it.

3- About a Companion standing armed outside their camp and Sayyidah Safiya's feelings:

Unaware of such an affectionate talk between Holy Prophet (PBUH) and Sayyidah Safiya, , one of the pious Companions, Sayyidina Abu Ayub, stood armed outside their camp for the fear that Sayyidah Safiya, whose father and brother were killed in the battle, may try to harm the Prophet (PBUH) (Ibn Saad 8/126). Some Missionaries refer to this happening giving an impression as if Sayyidah Safiya was forced into marriage and was really unhappy. While the very conversation quoted above belies such a notion, it must also be known that Abu Ayub (RA) was standing there voluntarily and Holy Prophet (PBUH) had not made him to stand there as he knew the actual position of Sayyidah Safiya. The pious companion in his innocence didn't know and the cunning polemicists in their evil designs run away from the fact that much before Holy Prophet (PBUH) reached Khyber the All-Wise, the Almighty had sown the seeds of the love of the Prophet in the heart of Sayyidah Safiya.

When Allah's Messenger (PBUH) **reached Khyber and Safiya was a bride, she saw in her dream that a sun came into her lap. She mentioned it before her husband. He said; 'By Allah you do not wish for anyone except the King who has come upon us.' Allah's Messenger conquered Khyber and her husband was killed. From that time (of dream) she loved that the Prophet** (PBUH) **may marry her.** (Tabarani Kabeer, Hadith 19667)

Ibn Umar narrates: **In the eye of Sayyidah Safiya was a scar. Holy Prophet** (PBUH) **said to her, 'What is this scar in your eye?' She said, 'I mentioned before my husband that I saw a moon falling into my lap in a dream so he slapped me and said; 'Do you long for the King of Yathrib [i.e. Holy Prophet pbuh]' She said: 'There was none more hateful to me then Allah's Messenger** (PBUH) **as he killed my father and husband. [But] the Prophet** (PBUH) **vindicated, 'O Safiya your father instigated the Arabs against me**

and did this and this…' He kept on vindicating until that feeling (of hatred) vanished from me.' (Tabarani Kabeer, Hadith 19668)[1]

Taking together all the narrations above we come to know that Sayyidah Safiya had a feeling of affection for the Prophet (PBUH) before they met (Tabarani 19667). When her father and husband were killed in the battle she developed some feeling of hatred for the Prophet (PBUH) for natural reasons but when the Prophet (PBUH) explained to her what all her father did to him (Tabarani 19668) she realized that her father met such an end because of his own deeds (Ibn Saad 8/123) and so her ill feelings for the Prophet (PBUH) completely vanished and she was left with the feelings of love for the Prophet (PBUH) that the All-Wise and Almighty had put in her heart through a dream (Tabarani 19667 & 19668).

Truly unique and inscrutable are the ways of My Lord!

4- Why the Prophet used to visit all his wives in one night?

Some of the Christians use the following tradition and yell obscenities against the Holy Prophet (PBUH) saying that he had passion for women.

Narrated Anas: "The Prophet I used to go round (have sexual relations with) all his wives in one night, and he had nine wives."

But as a matter of fact this is clearly wrong translation and the words within parenthesis do not find any place here by any stretch whatsoever.

1- Actual text of the Hadith and correct translation:

Now the Hadith goes as;

أَنَّ النَّبِيَّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ كَانَ يَطُوفُ عَلَى نِسَائِهِ فِي لَيْلَةٍ وَاحِدَةٍ وَلَهُ تِسْعُ نِسْوَةٍ

The word ,**يَطُوفُ** like طواف i.e. circumambulating the Holy Ka'ba only refers to going around and has no other nuance whatsoever. So the correct translation of the Hadith is:

Narrated Anas: The Prophet I used to go round all his wives in one night, and he had nine wives." (Bukhari, Hadith 275)

There is nothing special in the Hadith. It infact shows that he cared for all his wives and went to see them.

The query probably rises from the famous translation of this Hadith which is there in well known software. In that software it reads;

[1] Albāni classified it as Sahih in his *Silsala Sahiha* H. 2793

"The Prophet I used to go round (have sexual relations with) all his wives in one night, and he had nine wives."

One can clearly see that the words ‘*have sexual relations with’* are in parenthesis, that is to say these are not the direct meanings of the Arabic words but addition by the translator to help understand *according to his understanding.*

But I disagree with his understanding and thus believe that these words in the parentheses are not helping to understand better but are rather misleading. Holy Prophet (PBUH) did visit them all but its not that he had sexual relations with each of them.

2- <u>Details of Prophet’s visits to his wives:</u>

Urwa reported on the authority of his father:
‘Aisha said: **"O my nephew, the Messenger of Allah** (PBUH) **did not prefer one of us to other in respect of his division of time of his staying with us. It was very rare that he did not visit any of us any day. He would come near each of his wives without having any intercourse with her until he reached the one who had her day (i.e. her turn) and passed his night with her...."**
(Sunan Abu Dawud Hadith 2135)[1]

It makes it clear beyond all doubt here that he visited all of them just to see them and dint have intercourse with each of them but only with the one whose turn was it that day.

3- <u>Further Clarification</u>:

I know some Muslims will have a query and some Opponents of Truth will argue as to why then certain Muslim scholars have held the view opposite to an explicit narration. Some may think the narration from ‘'Aisha (RA) is just an aberrant one.

Let me clarify the whole issue in the following lines;

1- Besides Sunan Abu Dawud the narration is found in,
Musnad Ahmad (No. 23621)
Baihaqi's Sunan Al-Kubra (7/75, 7/300)
Mustadrak Al-Hakim (No. 2710)
Sunan Darqutni (No.3781)

2- The opinion of the scholars who follow the line as taken by the translator is rather weak.
a- Such scholars have based their assertion on the narration from a couple of companions (Anas (RA) and one more) who narrate that Prophet (PBUH) visited all his wives in a single night and took just one bath afterwards.

[1] Albāni classified it as Hasan Sahih.

b- To me there is no contradiction between such Ahadith and the one I quoted. Holy Prophet (PBUH) must have taken only one bath but those companions have not given the details of Prophet's visit to his wives. And obviously they could never!

c- Even if some of the companions ever said anything that could be made the basis of words inserted in parenthesis they will certainly be overlooked when they contradict a report from Prophet's (PBUH) wife. And who could know the details of such extremely private affairs of the Prophet' life better than his wives?

Now what we see is that these 'scholars' (Missionaries) who have put on the glasses of prejudice without catering for to know the real meanings pour out their inner wickedness. May Allah give them guidance!

5- <u>Why were the Wives of the Prophet not allowed to remarry after his demise?</u>

Certain polemicists try to make an issue of the Qur'anic verse that declares that forbids people to marry the wives of the Holy Prophet (PBUH) after his demise. The verse goes as:

"O ye who believe! …Nor is it right for you that ye should annoy Allah's Messenger, or that ye should marry his widows after him at any time. Truly such a thing is in Allah's sight an enormity." (Qur'an 33:53)

Such polemics try arguing that it was unjust to the wives to be forbidden to remarry. But such an argument is shows total ignorance of the details of the issue and status of the wives of the Prophet (PBUH) in the House of Islam.

1- <u>Wives of the Prophet (PBUH) are Mothers of the Believers:</u>

In very clear terms Qur'an calls the Wives of the Holy Prophet (PBUH) as the Mothers of the Believers. Allah says in the Holy Qur'an:

"The Prophet is closer to the Believers than their own selves, and his wives are their mothers." (Qur'an 33:6)

This shows the strong spiritual relation between the Holy Prophet's wives and the Believers and obviously the command under discussion goes very much in consonance with their status mentioned here. None with even the slightest sense of morality will ever take an exception to it.

2- <u>They will remain the wives of the Prophet (PBUH) even in the world hereafter:</u>

Further we read in Hadith a prayer of the Holy Prophet (PBUH) regarding his wives. It is stated:

Allah's Messenger (PBUH) **said: 'I asked Allah that I marry none of my people but she be with me in the Heaven and I was granted.'** (Mustadrik Al-Hakim, Hadith 4650)[1]

And as they were to be the wives of the Prophet (PBUH) both here and hereafter so the wives of the Holy Prophet (PBUH) were not allowed to marry any other person. Following narration makes it absolutely clear:

Allah's Messenger (PBUH) said: '[In the Paradise,] a woman will be with her last husband.' (Tabaqaat Abu Shaikh p.270)[2]

Huzaifa said to his wife, 'If you wish to be my wife in the Heaven do not marry anyone after me for a woman will be with last of his husbands and for this reason Allah forbade it for the wives of the Prophet (PBUH) **to remarry after him.'** (Mushkil Al-Athaar 2/147 Hadith 552)

6- Did Holy Prophet (pbuh) commit sin?

We will often find Christians taking a lot of pain to prove that Prophet Muhammad was not sinless and Prophet Jesus was so. Indeed all the Prophets including, Jesus and Muhammad, peace be upon them both, were sinless and at times some mistakes made by them were not sins as such. In the following lines we do explain the whole thing and expose another Christian lie.

1- Some Qur'anic Verses And Their Actual Meaning:

Allah Almighty says in the Holy Qur'an:

"Patiently, then, persevere: for the Promise of Allah is true: and ask forgiveness for thy fault (*wastaghfir li-zanbika*) , and celebrate the Praises of thy Lord in the evening and in the morning." (Qur'an 40:55)

"Know, therefore, that there is no god but Allah, and ask forgiveness for thy fault (*wastaghfir li-zanbika*), and for the men and women who believe: for Allah knows how ye move about and how ye dwell in your homes." (Qur'an 47:19)

"That Allah may forgive thee (*li-yaghfira laka*) thy faults (*zanbika*) of the past and those to follow; fulfill His favour to thee; and guide thee on the Straight Way;" (Qur'an 48: 2)

2- A Token Of Humility And Modesty:

One of the morals taught to man by Islam is also this: however hard and sincerely may man be trying to serve and worship his Lord and fighting and struggling in the cause of His Religion, he should never be involved in the misunderstanding that he has done and accomplished whatever he was required to do. Rather, on the contrary, he should have the feeling that he has not been able to do full justice to what was expected of him by his Lord and Master. Therefore, he should confess his errors constantly and pray to Allah saying *'Lord, forgive me for whatever fault and error I may have committed in Your service."* , this is indeed the essence of Allah's

[1] Hakim authenticated it.
[2] Albāni classified it as Sahih in *Silsala Sahiha* H. 1281

Command: *'O Prophet. ask forgiveness for your fault .."* And in Hadith we find Holy Prophet (PBUH) praying exactly on the same lines, e.g.

“O Allah! Forgive me my sins that I did in the past or will do in the future, and also the sins I did in secret or in public.” (Sahih Bukhari, Hadith 5919)

This does not mean that the Holy Prophet had actually committed an error willfully, but its correct meaning is that it did not even behoove the servant who was the greatest worshiper of his Lord that he should harbor even a tinge of the pride of accomplishment in his heart, but his true position also was that in spite of all his great and glorious services he should continue confessing his shortcomings before his Lord. It was under this state of the mind that the Holy Prophet often implored his Lord for forgiveness.

One also needs to understand that for a person with more responsibility and greater honor, the standards are also different. Holy Prophet (PBUH) received direct revelations from the Almighty so he was supposed to be the best and at times when he had actually done no wrong as we can see, he was still admonished because of the higher levels set for him.

Further, there is a Hadith that gives the answer of the Holy Prophet (PBUH) as to why did he pray to Allah so much and seek His Mercy:

Narrated Al-Mughira (RA): **The Prophet used to offer night prayers till his feet became swollen. Somebody said, to him," "Allah has forgiven you, your faults of the past and those to follow." On that, he said, "Shouldn't I be a thankful slave of Allah)?"** (Bukhari, Hadith 4459)

3- <u>A Teaching For The Followers</u>:

Holy Prophet (PBUH) used to ask Allah for forgiveness as a token of his modesty and also to teach his companions and followers to do the same.

Narrated Abu Huraira: I heard Allah's Messenger saying.**" By Allah! I ask for forgiveness from Allah and turn to Him in repentance more than seventy times a day."** (Sahih Bukhari, Hadith 5832)

Another narration makes it absolutely clear that he prayed to Allah this way as a token of modesty and more importantly to teach his followers:

Ibn Umar narrated: I heard Allah's Messenger saying, **"O people ask Allah for forgiveness verily I ask Him for forgiveness hundred times a day."** (Musnad Ahmad Hadith 17173)

The very words of the Hadith above prove that he did and said this to inspire his followers to repent to Allah often.

Another interesting point we need to consider here is that Qur’an 48:2 quoted above which says all the past and future sins of the Holy Prophet (pbuh) are forgiven was revelaed in 6th year after Hijrah while Abu Huraira, who is the narrator of the Hadith saying that Holy Prophet (pbuh) repented 70 times a day, accepted Islam and came to the Holy Prophet in the 7th year after Hijrah. This proves Holy Prophet (pbuh) prayed even after Allah that verse was revealed. This is enough to prove that it was only out of modesty and to teach the followers.

4- <u>Etymology Of The Arabic Words Used</u>:

According to *Mufradaat fi Gharaib al-Qur'an*, a book on the etymology of the Qur'anic words, by Isfahani, the word '***Ghafar***' means;

'To cover with something that protects from dirt' (1/362).

Keeping this in mind the verses can mean that Holy Prophet (PBUH) is asked to pray to be saved from the sins.

And as to the word '*zanb*' which generally means 'sin' Isfahani in his above mentioned books says;

'It is used for every deed whose outcome is not good.' (1/181)

This makes it evident that the word can be used for everything whose outcome is not good or as expected. The following supports our contention on these lines.

5- <u>An Example Of A 'Sin' When It Comes To The Prophet (PBUH):</u>

Holy Prophet (PBUH) was once even admonished by the Almighty and that one event clearly shows what the matter was. It is stated in Qur'an 80:1.

"He frowned and turned away his face because there came up to him the blind man. And what would make you know that he might reform, or heed the admonition, and admonishing might profit him? As for him who is indifferent, to him you attend, though you would not be responsible if he did not reform. And the one 'who comes to you running, of his own will, and fears, from him you turn away."(Qur'an 80:1-10)

It so happened that Holy Prophet (PBUH) was talking to some leaders of Makkah who had not embraced Islam and right them one of his companions Ibn Umm Maktum came in and Holy Prophet (PBUH) disliked his entry at that time. In fact Holy Prophet (PBUH) thought that even if a single man from among the people whom he was trying to bring to the right path, listened to him and was rightly guided, be could become a powerful means of strengthening Islam. Therefore, none of his companions should interrupt at that time; whatever he wanted to ask or learn, he could ask or learn at some later time.

By this style the Holy Prophet (PBUH), by a subtle method, has been made to realize that it was an act unseemly for him. Had somebody familiar with his high morals witnessed it, he would have thought that it was not he but some other person who had behaved in that manner.

So, this was a deed which the Holy Prophet (PBUH) did, and was disliked by the Almighty Allah. We can see Holy Prophet's (PBUH) intention was not to commit sin and hurt anyone but Allah who knew that those to the Prophet was talking were not sincere but the blind man who came was sincere. And so he was admonished.

This is a clear manifestation that for Holy Prophet (PBUH) the standards were much higher. And so what's called a 'sin' is only this much when it comes to The Most Perfect of All Humans.

6- <u>Question for Christians</u>:

Having explained the Qur'anic verses that Christians misinterpret, now we come to the Bible and what it tells us about Jesus Christ (PBUH) whom Christians take not a holy man or perfect human but God Incarnate.

According to the Gospel of Matthew:

Jesus (PBUH) prayed to the Father in the Heaven; **"And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors."** (Matthew 6:12)

The Greek word translated as 'debts' is **opheilēma (*of-i'-lay-mah*)**, which according to Strong's Bible Dictionary (Entry G3783) means **'something owed, that is, (figuratively) a due.; morally a fault: - debt.'** In Thayer's lexicon the words **'offense'** and **'sin'** are clearly used.

Infact according to **Smith and Van Dyke Arabic Bible**, the words used to denote the actual Greek words are *'waghfirlana zunubana'* i.e. forgive us our sins. Infact same words are used in Qur'an and Hadith where there is a mention of sin concerning Prophet Muhammad (PBUH).

Agreed that the context of the verse says he asked his disciples to pray this way but Bible proves he himself often prayed to God and it no where says he prayed differently.

Further **Jesus (pbuh) was Baptized** by John the Baptist and we know about John the Basptist; **"And he came into all the country about Jordan, preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins."** (Luke 3:3)

Now Christians can take only two courses; either they can argue that this is only in fugitive sense or a lesson for the disciples and later followers. We, the Muslims, have no problem with either of these explanations but this only exposes the double standards of the Christians.

If Jesus Christ, the 'God Incarnate' and a 'God' himself can pray for the forgiveness of his sins and take the Bapstism of repentance then there is no problem in Prophet Muhammad who was human only, indeed the best and perfect of them but a human still, doing the same. A human, however great needs to show his modesty but not so a divine person as Christians think of Jesus.

And also the fact that it makes more sense of Prophet Muhammad (PBUH), who came with a doctrine of salvation based on good deeds and repentance, asking the Almighty God for forgiveness teaching his followers the same then Jesus (PBUH) who as per Christian belief brought the gift of salvation merely through his own vicarious sacrifice.

These double standards of the Christians remind one of Jesus (PBUH) who said:

"First cast out the beam out of your own eye; and then shall you see clearly to cast out the mote out of your brother's eye." (Matthew 7:5)

And also: **"You blind guides, you strain out a gnat, and swallow the camel."** (Mathew 23:24)

7- <u>On physical conditions the Prophet (PBUH) experienced at the time of revelation</u>

Awe-stricken by the fact the Holy Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) remains unparalleled in his achievements in all the fields of human interest or in the words of Michael H. Hart '***the only man in history who was supremely successful on both the religious and secular levels***'**,** the Rivals of the Truth did not find any other way but to somehow neglect the rational rule given in their own book ***'Ye shall know them by their fruits'*** and to turn their focus to what the Prophet (PBUH) experienced at the time of revelation in a bid to create confusions exaggerating the simple things.

The lies and myths we shall try to put off today are;

1- Some evil spirit or the devil himself visited him.

2- The Prophet suffered from epilepsy.

All these ideas are said to be based on the narrations giving the accounts of the physical experiences Prophet (PBUH) had at the time of revelation. So firstly we shall discuss those narrations in detail and then comment on the above mentioned baseless assertions.

1- <u>Prophet's (PBUH) physical experiences at the time of revelation</u>:

The physical conditions the Prophet (PBUH) underwent at the time of revelation were not always the same and the reason is that the modes of revelations also varied from time to time. Sometimes the Angel appeared in his original form, sometimes like a man *et cetera et cetera*.

In a Hadith 'Aisha (RA) says; **'Verily I saw the Prophet being inspired Divinely on a very cold day and noticed the Sweat dropping from his forehead.'** (Sahih Bukhari, Hadith 2)

According to another narration; '**The Prophet's face was red and he kept on breathing heavily for a while and then he was relieved** …' (Sahih Bukhari, Hadith 4602)

2- <u>Why the Prophet (PBUH) had such experiences</u>?

What was the reason for all this? To understand consider the following;

a- Allah says in the Qur'an;

"We are going to send down to you a weighty discourse." (Qur'an 73:5)

'The Qur'an has been called a weighty Word also for the reason that acting on its commands, demonstrating its teaching practically, extending its invitation in the face of the whole world, and bringing about a revolution in the entire system of belief and thought, morals and manners, civilization and social life, according to it, is indeed the weightiest task any human being ever has been charged with: It has been called a weighty Word also because bearing the burden of its revelation was a difficult and heavy duty.' (Tafhim al-Qur'an)

b- Experience of revelation was obviously Prophet's interaction with the angelic, superhuman domain and all the physical affects were only due to this extra-ordinary communication. Ibn Khaldun, a classical philosopher historian explains the point in detail. Discussing the phenomenon of inspiration various types of human beings who have supernatural perception either through natural disposition or through exercise he writes;

"A (third) kind (of soul) is by nature suited to exchange humanity altogether, both corporeal and spiritual humanity, for angelicality of the highest stage, so that it may actually become an angel in the flash of a moment, glimpse the highest group within their own stage, and listen to essential speech and divine address during that moment. (Individuals possessing this kind of soul) are prophets. God implanted and formed in them the natural ability to slough off humanity in that moment which is the state of revelation."

And then discussing the verse; '**We are going to send down to you a weighty discourse'** and the narrations about the tough physical conditions that the Prophet (PBUH) had to face at the time of revelation he continues;

"The reason, as we have established, is that revelation means leaving one's humanity, in order to attain angelic perceptions and to hear the speech of the soul. This causes pain, since it means that an essence leaves its own essence and exchanges its own stage for the ultimate stage (of the angels). This is the meaning of the choking feeling which Muhammad referred to in connection with the beginning of revelation in his statement: "And he (Gabriel) choked me until it became too much for me; then he released me. Then he said, 'Read,' and I replied, 'I cannot read.' He did this a second and a third time, as the tradition tells." (Muqaddimah Book 1, Chapter 6. Translated by Franz Rosenthal)

3- Different modes of Revelation and the Prophet's physical experiences:

Having known that the tough physical conditions that Prophet (PBUH) had to undergo were a result of his interaction with a super-human world let us see some of the Ahadith about different modes of revelation (i.e. contact with the super-human angelic world) and the various conditions corresponding to those modes. Here we shall discuss two of them only which will be enough to prove that the physical experiences varied with modes of revelation.

a- Ringing of the bells:

In Sahih Bukhari we have the statement of the Holy Prophet (PBUH) describing the phenomenon of revelation;

"Sometimes it is like the ringing of a bell, this form of Inspiration is the hardest of all and then this state passes ' off after I have retained what is inspired." (Sahih Bukhari, Hadith 2)

What is the significance of relating revelation to the idea of ringing of a bell? This is not mentioned in any Hadith but some scholars have given quite plausible explanations.

Shaykh Anwar Shah Kashmiri has quoted from Shaykh Ibn Arabi the most subtle explanation;

'He states that the simile has been used in two respects;

a- Firstly it pertains to the continuity of the sound,

b- And secondly in so far as it is difficult to ascertain the direction of the sound of a bell continuously ringing as it appears to be coming from all directions, His words are heard from all directions.

The exact perception of this state is not possible without actual observation but the Holy Prophet (PBUH) used the simile of ringing bells to bring it as near to the common understanding as possible,’ (An Approach to Qur’anic Sciences p.40 cf. Faidh Al-Bari 1/19-20)

Karen Armstrong makes a valid point when she says; **“Revelation cannot be described in a simple manner.”** (Muhammad Prophet of Our Time, p.49 pub. Harper Press 2006)

About this manner of revelation the Prophet (PBUH) said; **“It is the hardest of all”.** This was owing to the fact that there was no direct and common way of interaction but rather a super-human one. This is what made it the hardest of all the forms of revelation.

b- <u>Angel coming in the human form</u>:

Same Hadith also mentions, **“Sometimes the Angel comes in the form of a man and talks to me and I retain whatever he says.”**

In another Hadith about this form of revelation it is mentioned, the Prophet (PBUH) said;

“And this form is the easiest for me.” (Al-Ittiqan 1/50 cf. Sahih Abu Awana)

c- <u>Analysis and Conclusion</u>:

Comparison of these two forms of revelation supports the earlier explanation about the nature of revelation that physical concomitants of revelation were due to the communication with another –superhuman- world. The more unnatural the contact more extreme were the concomitants. If the angel came in the human form it was not an extraordinary burden on the Holy Prophet (PBUH). But if only the voice of the angel or directly the words of Allah were heard it was an extraordinary state and Holy Prophet (PBUH) had great burden upon him and faced trouble to grasp what was told.

4- <u>Was the Prophet (PBUH) deceived by Satan regarding revelation</u>?

Some of the master liars allege that Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) was possessed / deceived by devil. Nothing can be far from truth than this!

Let me briefly respond to common baseless assertions;

a- <u>Accusation by the wife of Abu Lahb</u>:

Some refers to a narration from Sahih Bukhari in which the words of the wife of Abu Lahb are given that she said when Prophet (PBUH) was sick and could not offer late night prayers; ***“O Muhammad! I think that your Satan has forsaken you, for I have not seen him with you for two or three nights!".***

But this proves nothing. She was infidel and stubborn rejecter of truth. Qur’an Surah 111 testifies to this. If allegation of disbelievers proves something than what would these people say about Jesus (PBUH) who was also accused of being possessed by Beelzebub and the ‘prince of demons’ (See Mark 3:22).

b- <u>Satan can disguise as angel</u>:

Some use a passage from Bible to assert that Satan can disguise as an angel (2 Corinthians 11:13-15)

Firstly even if Satan can actually disguise as an angel it does not mean that no angel can ever come by himself. If only because it is possible, the same was true in case of Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) than what prove do Christians have Paul was not deceived by Satan in his so-called vision on the road to Damascus?

Following account as recorded in Sirat Ibn Hisham also belies the claim of the liars.

[Khadija] said to the apostle of Allah, 'O son of my uncle, are you able to tell me about your visitant, when he comes to you?' He replied that he could, and she asked him to tell her when he came. So when Gabriel came to him, as he was wont, the apostle said to Khadija, 'This is Gabriel who has just come to me.' 'Get up, O son of my uncle,' she said, 'and sit by my left thigh'. The apostle did so, and she said, 'Can you see him?' 'Yes.' he said. She said, 'the turn round and sit on my right thigh.' He did so, and she said, 'Can you see him?' When he said that he could she asked him to move and sit on my right ' He did so, and she said, 'Can you see him? When he said that he could, she asked him to move and sit in her lap. When he had done this she again asked if he could see him, and when he said yes, she disclosed her form and cast aside her veil while the apostle was sitting in her lap. Then she said, 'Can you see him?' And he replied, 'No.' She said, 'O son of my uncle, rejoice and be of good heart, by Allah he is an angel and not a Satan.' (Sirat Ibn Hisham p.94. Translated by Guillaume)

c- <u>Bell, the instrument of Devil</u>:

Some refer to the Ahadith which say that "Bell is the instrument of Devil" and relating to the Ahadith in which Prophet (PBUH) said that at the time of revelation he listens to voice like ringing of the bell, they argue that it means the experience of revelation had Satan's rule in it.

This is over simplification! We have in detail discussed the narration about revelation and sound like ringing of the bell. The very fact that Prophet (PBUH) termed the voice he heard LIKE the voice of ringing bells. The word 'LIKE' is significant which proves the absurdity of the parallel drawn between different Ahadith. Ringing of the bells is by no means so novel a phenomenon that Prophet (PBUH) would fail to describe it with certainty instead of making it just an object of simile.

5- <u>Do the physical concomitants of revelation prove the charge of epilepsy</u>?

Some of the orientalists and Christian missionaries say that physical concomitants of revelation show that the Prophet (PBUH) suffered from epilepsy and all his experience of revelation was merely the result of that disease. I reproduce here the words of a certain orientalist who realized that such allegation were absolutely. W. Montgomery Watt writes;

'Opponents of Islam have often asserted that Muhammad had epilepsy, and therefore his religious experiences had no validity. As a matter of fact, the symptoms described are not identical with those of epilepsy, since the disease leads of physical and metal degeneration, whereas Muhammad was in the fullest possession of his faculties to the very end. But even if the allegation were true, the argument would be completely unsound and based on mere ignorance and prejudice; such physical concomitants neither validate nor invalidate religious experience.' (Muhammad at Mecca p.57 pub. Oxford 1953)

6- <u>A parallel from the Biblical narratives</u>:

We will often find Christians referring to above discussed Ahadith and then comparing it with Biblical accounts of prophets and holy men having visions etc. Some especially like to 'contrast' it with the vision of Paul on the road to Damascus. My response to this way of looking at things is two fold;

a- In case of Biblical prophets we do not have detailed accounts. Even the most exhaustive details about some prophet in the Bible do not make more than just a fraction of the treasure of narrations about the life details of Prophet Muhammad (PBUH). So only because something is not mentioned does not prove that it never happened. To argue such a thing will be a logical fallacy, known as argument from ignorance (*argumentum ad ignorantiam*).

b- But you see, even in the Biblical narratives we have something to put Christians to shame. Here I quote a passage from the Book of Daniel;

"And I Daniel alone saw the vision: for the men that were with me saw not the vision; but a great quaking fell upon them, so that they fled to hide themselves. (8) Therefore I was left alone, and saw this great vision, and there remained no strength in me: for my comeliness was turned in me into corruption, and I retained no strength. (9) Yet heard I the voice of his words: and when I heard the voice of his words, then was I in a deep sleep on my face, and my face toward the ground. (10) And, behold, an hand touched me, which *set me upon my knees and upon the palms of my hands.* (11) And he said unto me, O Daniel, a man greatly beloved, understand the words that I speak unto thee, and stand upright: for unto thee am I now sent. And when he had spoken this word unto me, *I stood trembling.* (12) Then said he unto me, Fear not, Daniel: for from the first day that thou didst set thine heart to understand, and to chasten thyself before thy God, thy words were heard, and I am come for thy words. (13) But the prince of the kingdom of Persia withstood me one and twenty days: but, lo, Michael, one of the chief princes, came to help me; and I remained there with the kings of Persia. (14) Now I am come to make thee understand what shall befall thy people in the latter days: for yet the vision is for many days. (15) *And when he had spoken such words unto me, I set my face toward the ground, and I became dumb.* (16) And, behold, one like the similitude of the sons of men touched my lips: then I opened my mouth, and spake, and said unto him that stood before me, *O my lord, by the vision my sorrows are turned upon me, and I have retained no strength.* (17) For how can the servant of this my lord talk with this my lord? for as for me, straightway there remained no strength in me, *neither is there breath left in me."* (Daniel 10: 7-17)

The underlined words show the similarity between what Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) experienced and what happened to the Biblical prophets. Will Christians doubt Daniel's prophethood too or just resort to double standards?

7- Testimony of a Christian scholar:

In his commentary to the words, '***and when he had spoken this word unto me, I stood trembling***' (Dan. 10: 11) John Gill writes;

'he got up and stood upon his feet, as the angel had bid him, but trembling and tottering, not yet recovered from his fainting fit; like a man that has been ill, and got upon his legs again, trembles and totters as he goes or stands: …the appearance of such a divine messenger had such an effect upon him, as we find such appearances used to have on good men.' (ONLINE SOURCE)

8- Summary:

a- The physical concomitants of revelation were due to extra-ordinary nature of the experience in which the Prophet (PBUH) had to interact with a different world.

b- The severity of physical experiences varied with the form of revelation. More extraordinary the forms of revelation, more tough were the concomitants.

c- Prophet (PBUH) used metaphorical language to describe the phenomenon as it as ‘revelation cannot be described in simple words.’

d- All the arguments about considering the supernatural agent coming to the Prophet (PBUH) are unfounded and raise tough questions for Christians on similar accounts.

e- In the Book of Daniel, we find a parallel between what the Prophet of Islam (PBUH) experienced and what happened to Biblical prophets when they had visions from God.

f- Christian scholars agree that supernatural experiences cause such affects on holy men.

9- Final word:

To conclude I quote Thomas Carlyle from one of his lectures concerning Western view of the person of Holy Prophet (PBUH);

“The lies, which well-meaning zeal has heaped round this man, are disgraceful to ourselves only.” (Heroes and Hero Worship, Lecture II, The Hero as Prophet, Friday May 8th, 1840)

.

1- Are women deficient in intelligence?

Many anti-Islamic polemic writers specially the Christian Missionaries often quote a Hadith and yell obscenities about Islam and Holy Prophet (PBUH). The Hadith they quote is;

Narrated Abu Said Al-Khudri: **Once Allah's Messenger went out to the Musalla (to offer the prayer) o 'Id-al-Adha or Al-Fitr prayer. Then he passed by the women and said, "O women! Give alms, as I have seen that the majority of the dwellers of Hell-fire were you (women)." They asked, "Why is it so, O Allah's Messenger?" He replied, "You curse frequently and are ungrateful to your husbands. I have not seen anyone more deficient in intelligence and religion than you. A cautious sensible man could be led astray by some of you." The women asked, "O Allah's Messenger! What is deficient in our intelligence and religion?" He said, "Is not the evidence of two women equal to the witness of one man?" They replied in the affirmative. He said, "This is the deficiency in her intelligence. Isn't it true that a woman can neither pray nor fast during her menses?" The women replied in the affirmative. He said, "This is the deficiency in her religion."** (Sahih Bukhari, Hadith 293)

Two questions are raised about this Hadith. Firstly why does the Hadith say that women will majority in the hell and does it not condemn women this way? And secondly why did the Prophet say that women are deficient in intelligence and religion. As to first question, why the Hadith says women form the majority in the hell? You can find the answer HERE
Here we address the second question.

1- Context of the Hadith:

Firstly we need to see that this was said in a proper context, Holy Prophet (PBUH) was asking people to raise funds for Jihad at the eve of Eid (one of the two yearly Islamic festivals) so he asked women using a figure of speech called **synecdoche** (*majaz mursal*) i.e. using the whole for the part: intelligence to refer to the legal testimony and religion to refer to prayers and fasting in specific monthly days. Later part of the Hadith testifies this. The Prophet (PBUH) was actually inviting women to generously donate in the way of Allah as they were to miss the reward of practically waging Jihad. This can be well understood and its astounding affect can be observed if we refer to other Ahadith.

Jabir b. 'Abdullah reported: I observed prayer with the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) on the 'Id day. He commenced with prayer before the sermon without Adhan and Iqama. He then stood up leaning on Bilal, and he commanded (them) to be on guard (against evil for the sake of) Allah, and he exhorted (them) on obedience to Him, and he preached to the people and admonished them. He then walked on till he came to the women and preached to them and admonished them, and asked them to give alms, for most of them are the fuel for Hell. A woman having a dark spot on the cheek stood up and said: Why is it so, Messenger of Allah? He said: For you grumble often and show ingratitude to your spouse. **And then they began to give alms out of**

their ornaments such as their earrings and rings which they threw on to the cloth of Bilal.
(Sahih Muslim, Hadith 1467)

This makes it clear that the purpose of the saying those words to women was only to make them contribute more generously for the Noble Cause of Islam which they actually did.

Having clarified the context now we come to further details.

2- Are women actually somewhat deficient in intelligence?

This is a reality none can deny that men and women have differences regarding intellect and feelings. By intellect I only mean theoretical intellect or more simply; men are stronger then women in analytical, philosophical, hypothetical and socio-political aspects of intellect. This is why men are usually better then women in mathematics and pure sciences. That's why most of the research work and inventions come from men and most of the Noble Prize laureates are also men. According to a BBC Report, a research published in British Journal of Psychology shows that on average men are five points ahead of women on I.Q. tests.

Women on the other hand are stronger in emotions by nature and this indeed is much important considering the fact that emotions influence all the human actions. A mother understands what her baby is up to in a way no father can ever. Briefly we can say that men have more I.Q. (Analytical and Logical intelligence) and women have more E.Q. (Emotional Intelligence). [According to a Research made by Multi-Health Systems, Inc. (MHS) women score better than men on most measures in E.Q. including Empathy, Social Responsibility and Interpersonal Relationships]

3- On the whole Man and Woman are equal:

Thus we see that both men and women excel in one thing and lack in another when compared among each other. So they are both in need of each other. Men need women because of their emotions and women need men by the way of their intelligence. That's why we read in Hadith;

Narrated 'Aisha, Holy Prophet (PBUH) said: **"Assuredly, women are the twin halves of men."**
(Jami' Tirmidhi, Hadith 113)[1]

So we see that what was said by the Holy Prophet (PBUH) was true indeed and it was only emphasized in a particular context.

4- True Criterion of Excellence:

But one thing that needs to be remembered is that intelligence, whether Emotional or Logical, is no criteria to gauge a human being. The sole criterion is righteousness and piety. Allah Almighty says in the Holy Qur'an:

[1] Albāni classified it as Sahih

"Verily the most honored of you in the sight of Allah is (he who is) the most righteous of you." (Al-Qur'an 49: 13)

2- Do women form majority in the hell?

Christians often use a Hadith to malign Islam that women are not given equal rights and are condemned to remain in the hell fire. While they lie they try to make some issue out of the following Hadith.

Narrated Ibn 'Abbas: The Prophet said: "I was shown the Hell-fire and that the majority of its dwellers were women who were ungrateful." It was asked, "Do they disbelieve in Allah?" (or are they ungrateful to Allah?) He replied, "They are ungrateful to their husbands and are ungrateful for the favors and the good (charitable deeds) done to them. If you have always been good (benevolent) to one of them and then she sees something in you (not of her liking), she will say, 'I have never received any good from you." (Sahih Bukhari, Hadith 28)

1- Context of the Hadith:

The very first thing that is a must to be kept in mind when going through the Islamic Sources is that you cannot pick up a verse or a Hadith, take it in isolation from the rest of Islamic rubric and run to races with it. This is criminal only. Indeed one has to consider all the various Ahadith pertaining to an issue one way or the other, consider the context of each of them and then draw some conclusion. Unfortunately most of the Christian readers of Qur'an and Hadith fail on this account.

Now clearly we see that at the time this was said, Holy Prophet (PBUH) was not actually dwelling on the point if men or women will form the majority in the Hell and Paradise, he was only asking women to mend their ways and was pointing to a common problem in the attitude of the women. This was his duty being *Al-Nazeer* (the Warner).

2- They do not go to hell for being women:

The Hadith does not say they go to hell for being woman, it actually points out to a wrong behavior on women's part. The real misunderstanding comes with the notion that women outnumber men in hell because of their womanhood. This is indeed wrong, there is nothing like that in the Hadith, not even in the least.

Secondly, most probably either men or women will be more in the hell. It's very difficult that they number exactly the same. Whoever will do more wrong deeds will be punished for that. It's about deeds not gender and that's where people take a wrong turn and are lead astray.

3- Women will outnumber men in Paradise:

Infact there is another Hadith which tells us that there will be more women in the Paradise then the men. It is recorded in Sahih Muslim.

Muhammad reported that some (persons) stated with a sense of pride and some discussed whether there would be more men in Paradise or more women. It was upon this that Abu Huraira reported that Abul Qasim (the Holy Prophet) (may peace be upon him) said: The (members) of the first group to get into Paradise would have their faces as bright as full moon during the night, and the next to this group would have their faces as bright as the shining stars in the sky, and every person would have two wives and the marrow of their shanks would glimmer beneath the flesh and there would be none without a wife in Paradise. (Muslim, Hadith 5062)

The context of Abu Huraira narrating this Hadith clearly shows that he meant to convey that according to Prophet's sayings, women will outnumber men in the Paradise.

Ibn Hujr while discussing the issue says: '**Abu Huraira used this Hadith as a proof to maintain that women will outnumber men in *Jannah* (paradise) … and this is much clear.'** (Fath Al-Baari 10/30)

Similarly in his commentary Nawawi has quoted scholars saying: '**It is clear from the Hadith that women will form the majority in the Paradise.'** (Sharah Al-Nawawi 9/216)

4- Ahadith about majority in hell do not tell the present or permanent state:

Lest one would say there is some contradiction in the both the Ahadith lets clarify another thing about the Ahadith that say women were in majority in the Hell.

All such Ahadith contain the words **'I was shown the Hell-fire'** and we know from other Ahadith that Holy Prophet (PBUH) was shown the Hell-Fire on his journey during the miraculous Night of Ascension. So we can easily conclude that Ahadith indicating women being in majority in the hell refer to the time when the Holy Prophet actually saw it and they do not mention if same is the case even now. (Faidh Al-Bari by Anwar Shah Kashmiri)

5- Some statistical facts:

Also we ought to keep in mind that women today outnumber men. Even if more males are born, their mortality rate is higher then female babies and we learn in Hadith that near the End of Times women will outnumber men greatly so if equal ratio of men and women goes to hell and the paradise even then it is quite possible that women remain in majority in both.

All the above details clarify that the Hadith no way means to convey that women will always be in majority in the hell. The Hadith only relates to what the Holy Prophet (PBUH) observed during his Miraculous Night Journey and he only narrated what he saw and emphasized it to warn the woman against being ungrateful and unnecessarily complaining to their husbands.

6- Women can complain against husbands for genuine reasons:

Let me make clear another point that the Hadith does not ask woman to bear with her husband even when he is wrong and refrain from complaining. No, this is not the case as we know that there is complete *Surah* (chapter) in the Qur'an i.e. *Surah Mujadila* (No. 58) which is about a woman who came to the Holy Prophet (PBUH) to complain against her husband and the Prophet (PBUH) did not say that she was going to hell for complaining

and infact he listened to her and Allah also revealed verses addressing the issue and condemning the unacceptable behavior of the husband.

7- Conclusion:

Thus the conclusion is that Holy Prophet (PBUH) only stated what had seen during his Miraculous Journey which is not bound to remain the same for ever. Infact other traditions plainly establish that women will be in majority in the paradise. And in the particular tradition that Christians dwell upon only asks women not to complain and be ungrateful to their husbands without reason.

3- Does Islam allow wife beating?

Some non-Muslims especially the Christians criticize and speak against Islam saying that Islam allows men to beat their wives. They refer to Qur'an 4:34 and pour out their inner filth.

Let's look into the issue:

Firstly, you can't just take a word of the Qur'an and comment the way you like. You ought to consider the whole Islamic moral and social make up, make a study in the very same context and then form your opinion; NOW consider the following points;

1- The context:

1-Islam asks both male and female to **restrict** themselves **only to their spouses**.
2-Islam, in the strongest manner possible, condemns every extra-marital relation.
3-The permission to (lightly) beat women is not unconditional, nor it is in every situation. Let's see its context; Qur'an says:

"**....therefore the righteous women are devotedly obedient, and guard in (the husband's) absence What Allah would have them guard. As to those women on whose part ye fear disloyalty and ill-conduct, Admonish them (first), Next, refuse to share their beds, (And last) beat them (lightly); But if they turn to obedience, Seek not against them, means (of annoyance): For Allah is Most High, Great (above you all).**" (Qur'an 4:34)

This makes it absolutely clear that this permission is **only** when women become disloyal--And again reading from start makes it clear that disloyalty here means something below dignity of a modest and chaste woman.

4-When a woman indulges into such an act then of a surety she would not be to her husband as she ought to be. This can even possibly make her husband slip away form the right path and he may get involved somewhere else. If such a stage arrives then this would be havoc not only for the couple and their relations but for the society as a whole. And this permission is deterrence and a necessity against evil.

2- It's allowed in extreme cases only:

1-Even in that case, to beat is the *last* option. First is to admonish, if this does not work then next step is to part from their beds, and if this also fails then is light beating.

2-And even if such a stage arrives then also their are restraints, **"But if they turn to obedience, Seek not against them, Means of annoyance"**

3-If at all a woman feels that she cannot live with her husband anymore, for any reason, she must get divorce and part, but as long as she is inside the marriage she must remain loyal to her husband even in his absence. For the mutual relation of the couple is the very basis of the society.

3- An Important Instruction:

When interpreting a verse we have to take in consideration the Hadith of Holy Prophet (PBUH). He said;

"Fear Allah concerning women! Verily you have taken them on the security of Allah, and intercourse with them has been made lawful unto you by words of Allah. You too have right over them, and that they should not allow anyone to sit on your bed whom you do not like. But if they do that, (in that case) chastise them in a way that leaves no mark (i.e. not severe). Their rights upon you are that you should provide them with food and clothing in a fitting manner."
(Sahih Muslim, Hadith 2137)

This shows it is more of a psychological thing then a physical one and the purpose is only to maintain the chastity and mutual love and affection of the spouses.

4- An unauthentic narration:

Some people try to mislead by quoting a narration which goes as:

Narrated Umar ibn al-Khattab: **The Prophet** (PBUH) **said: A man will not be asked as to why he beat his wife.** (Sunan Abu Dawud Hadith 2147. Albani classified it as Daeef)

Besides Albani, Ahmad Shakir and Shu'aib 'Arna'ut also classified it Daeef in their respective classification of Musnad Ahmad. Dhahbi and Haithmi also criticized its chain.

5- The Holy Bible on this issue:

Having known the Islamic view point now lets compare it with what Bible has to say about it;
Bible says;

"When men strive together one with another, and the wife of the one draweth near for to deliver her husband out of the hand of him that smiteth him, and putteth forth her hand, and taketh him by the secrets: Then thou shalt cut off her hand, thine eye shall not pity her."
(Deuteronomy 25:11-12)

Amazing! If Islam asks for a light beating in case a wife degrades herself by indulging in open-lewdness and thus showing disloyalty to her husband they say it's inhumane and barbaric! But if the poor wife in her love with her husband tries to save the life of her husband they say cut off her hand, don't pity her! Amazing! Even if she gets hold of that man by taking him by his secrets, still she is trying to protect her husband not going into open lewdness anyway.

You remember what Jesus (PBUH) said;

"You blind guides, you strain out a gnat, and swallow the camel." (Mathew 23:24)

So, the fact is that Islam allows this only in extreme conditions and that also not without restrictions. Infect Islam allows it only in the collective interest of the whole society and its more of a psychological punishment then a physical one. And those who make an issue out of it are ignorant of Islam's high moral and ethical standards while Biblical standpoint lacks reason. What Islam allows cannot be even termed as beating in ordinary sense but what Bible allows must be termed as wife butchering.

6- The ‘Civilized’ West, wife beating and ‘honor killings’:

Women suffer more violence at the hands of their spouses/partners in non-Muslim countries. ‘In Australia, Canada, Israel, South Africa and the United States, 40-70 per cent of female murder victims were killed by their partners.’ (Krug, E. et al. eds. 2002, *World Report on Violence and Health.* Geneva: WHO. Online Source)

According to a report for US Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, in US **‘Intimate partner violence made up 20% of violent crime against women in 2001.’** (Online Source)

Many would love to raise finger at Islam because of the reports of ‘honor killings’ from remote corners of Muslim lands. Being killed by one spouse is called ‘honor killing’ when it comes to Muslims and a less violent term ‘domestic violence’ is used when it comes to New Yorkers. According to a 2008 report from Department of Health and Mental Hygiene titles as ‘Intimate Partner Violence against Women in NYC’ reveals that between 2003 and 2005 nearly *half of all women murdered were victims of their partners.*

Now what’s the cause of all this above? Not Islam of course!

4- Does Islam equate women with donkeys & dogs? (Question of annulment of prayers)

It has been observed that many anti-Islamic sites are misquoting a Hadith and polluting the innocent minds about the noble faith of Islam.

The translation of the Hadith goes as;

Narrated '‘Aisha: The things which annul prayer were mentioned before me (and those were): a dog, a donkey and a woman. I said, "You have compared us (women) to donkeys and dogs. By Allah! I saw the Prophet praying while I used to lie in (my) bed between him and the Qibla. Whenever I was in need of something, I disliked to sit and to trouble the Prophet. So, I would slip away by the side of his feet." (Sahih Bukhari, Hadith 484)

They argue that as here woman, dogs & donkeys are mentioned together so this is a degradation of women.

1- The tradition itself contradicts the apparent meaning:

Infact if one is in his senses than the very text of the Hadith shows that its not Islam that-God Forbid!!- considers women as donkeys or dogs but it was the understanding of certain people whom Sayyidah ‘Aisha (RA) rebuked. Again read the translation of the Hadith with special attention to the words emphasized.

Narrated '‘Aisha: The things which annul prayers **were mentioned before me** (and those were): a dog, a donkey and a woman. I said, "**You have** compared us (women) to donkeys and dogs. **By Allah! I saw the Prophet praying while I used to lie in (my) bed between him and the Qibla.** Whenever I was in need of something, I disliked sitting and troubling the Prophet. So, I would slip away by the side of his feet."
(Bukhari, Hadith 484)

It’s plain enough that some people mentioned the things which, according to their understanding, annulled prayers and they mentioned "dog, donkey & woman".
But then Sayyidah ‘Aisha (RA) rebuked them by saying "You have compared us (women) to donkeys and dogs" and then she clarifies that this not something taught by the Messenger of Allah (PBUH) as, she said; **"By Allah! I saw the Prophet praying while I used to lie in (my) bed between him and the Qibla."**

So where is the confusion? The problem is the same that I often mention that these missionaries, these devil incarnates yell such obscenities only in an attempt to get rid of their frustration that they have when they see Islam as the fastest growing religion of the world.

2- Other Hadith and meaning of the ‘*annulment of Salah*’:

Now some people may bring some more Ahadith from the Holy Prophet (PBUH) himself like the following;

Narrated Abdullah ibn Abbas: Ikrimah reported on the authority of Ibn Abbas, saying: I think the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) said: "When one of you prays without a *sutrah*, **a dog, an ass, a pig, a Jew, a Magian, and a woman cut off his prayer**, **but it will suffice if they pass in front of him at a distance of over a stone's throw**."
(Abu Dawud, Hadith 703.)[1]

Abu Huraira reported: The Messenger of Allah (PBUH) said: "**A woman, an ass and a dog disrupt the prayer, but something like the back of a saddle guards against that**."
(Muslim, Hadith 790)

But even these Ahadith never mean that these things annul the prayers, it only means that they can divert ones attention, they disrupt the prayers.

Imam Nawawi, a famous Scholar writes in his commentary to this Hadith from Sahih Muslim;
"Here disruption only means to have a negative effect on the prayers by the way of occupation of heart in these things." (Sharah Al-Nawawi 2/266)

---

[1] Albāni classified it as Daeef

All these things mentioned here can disrupt one's attention. A Jew because of his particular appearance and the fact that they were having a row with Muslims then, seeing an adversary can obviously distract one's attention. A pig or an ass can become a source of distraction because of their course and loud voice and bad smell, a Magian because of his unusual appearance (see from the point of view of Arabs then). And a woman could distract because of her beauty while prayers need full time attention.

This is enough to prove that it's only about being a cause of distraction that women are mentioned with all these things. It's not that-God Forbid!!-some parallel is drawn here.

3- It's not to degrade woman. Read the following!

Now its not degradation for the females but only the truth is mentioned that if a woman passes in front of a man, this can get his attention diverted and that will effect the quality & sincerity of ones prayers. It never means that, God-Forbid, a parallel is being drawn between woman and other things mentioned. These are mentioned together only because they can divert ones attention.

See its just as if a person says;
"Humans, dogs & donkeys are all living beings", this does not mean that humans are considered equal or same as dogs & donkeys or some parallel is being drawn between all these. Or does it?

4- It's about mature women only:

And this is said for the grown up women only not small kids for they cannot divert ones attention in that sense.

Narrated Abdullah ibn Abbas: Qatadah said: I heard Jabir ibn Zayd who reported on the authority of Ibn Abbas; and Shu'bah reported the Prophet (peace be upon him) as saying: **A menstruating (i.e. grown up) woman and a dog cut off the prayer.**
(Abu Dawud, Hadith 704.)[1]

5- Nothing annuls Salah as such:

Nothing annuls the Salah as such but these things can disrupt ones attention. Read the following Hadith;

Narrated Ayyash bin Abu Rabiya:
The Prophet (PBUH) said: "**Nothing annuls prayers.**" (Darqutni, Hadith 1396.)[2]

In the end I'll only repeat a statement of Sayyidah 'Aisha from the very Hadith the heathen bring forward;

" By Allah! I saw the Prophet praying while I used to lie in (my) bed between him and the Qibla."

Hope all this will help understand!

[1] Albāni classified it as Sahih.
[2] Ibn Hujr classified it as Hasan in Dirayah 1/178.

5- Does Islam equate women with animals & slaves? (Question of seeking refuge)

Such an impression is given by some notorious anti-Islamic polemic writers but these insane souls forget that falsehood has no basis. We take a look of the issue here. They use the following Hadith:

Narrated Abdullah ibn Amr ibn al-'Aas: The Prophet (peace be upon him) said: If one of you marries a woman or buys a slave, he should say: "O Allah, I ask Thee for the good in her, and in the disposition Thou hast given her; I take refuge in Thee from the evil in her, and in the disposition Thou hast given her." When he buys a camel, he should take hold of the top of its hump and say the same kind of thing." (Sunan Abu Dawud, Hadith 2160.)[1]

True meaning of the Hadith:

Every individual person, or a thing or any being has both good and bad aspects. One would always wish to seek benefit of its goods and would run away from its evils, whoever or whatever he, she or it may be.

And these are women who enter a new household; she goes to the house of her husband. So the men are advised to ask Allah to let them receive of every good of their wives and to seek Allah's refuge from all their evils, for no-one are absolutely innocent.

A person may also get a new conveyance (for camel here stands for it) or buy a slave, as was the norm back then or some other thing like that, so for that as well, he is advised to ask Allah to let him receive of every good of that and to seek Allah's refuge from all its evils.

It is not that (May Allah forbid us) Islam is equating women and the animals, but it is for the owner of the household to seek to have every good and be protected from the evil of everyone who enters his household.

6- What Islam says about physical relations with slave women?

Non-Muslims especially Christians very often raise the point as to how Muslims treated the women captives of war. They say why Islam allowed Muslims to have physical relations with those women.

SEE who were the first recipients of the Message of Islam, they were Arabs, and like else where there was a custom in Arabia to take women captives of War. Actually the wars were on tribal bases, when the men were killed there women taken and undoubtedly they were treated very badly in Pre-Islamic Arabia.

Now there was the advent of Islam. Two things could have been done to abolish this bad practice.

[1] Classified as Hasan by Albāni.

1- To abolish it at once.
2- To do the same gradually with wisdom.

Islam preferred the second because if it would have been at once then thousands of women would have been at the mercy of the people who yet knew no manners. So ISLAM first asked them to be treated fairly and then also encouraged their manumission.

Islam put those women with none of their own to take care of them under the custody of Muslim men that they should treat them kindly; provide them board and lodge and give them respect. Imagine what could have been their fate of women without any protection in that particular environment where people married their own step-mothers?

Islam laid down rules which would eventually lead to eradicating the practice. So it allowed Muslims to have intercourse with slave women taken as captives of just and legitimate wars. In so doing, the woman would automatically become free if she got pregnant. What's more, her child would also become free.

<u>The intimate physical relation, if any, had to be consensual:</u>

The intimate physical relation had to be consensual. For, asking somebody to get into such a relation is against the very spirit of Islam. Read the following Hadith;

Narrated Abu Dharr: **The Prophet (peace be upon him) said: "Feed those of your slaves who please you from what you eat and clothe them with what you clothe yourselves, but sell those who do not please you and do not punish Allah's creatures."** (Sunan Abu Dawud, Hadith 5161)[1]

The Hadith clearly tells us that if slave woman does not please her master i.e. refuse to work for him or allow him to lay down with her, the master is supposed to get away with her. If he will not; he will indulge in something wrong i.e. he may force her into such an action and Hadith terms such an act as 'punishing Allah's creature.'

The following Hadith clearly says that it is unlawful to force a slave woman into physical relations.

Narrated Salamah ibn al-Muhabbaq: **The Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) made a decision about a man who had intercourse with his wife's slave-girl as follows. <u>If he forced her, she is free</u>, and he shall give her mistress a slave-girl similar to her; if she asked him to have intercourse voluntarily, she will belong to him, and he shall give her mistress a slave-girl similar to her.** (Sunan Abu Dawud, Hadith 4460) [2]

This is the most categorical Hadith maintaining that forced relationship is forbidden and it makes her free. Also,

The Prophet (PBUH) was narrated to have said; "He who slaps his slave or beats him, the expiation for it is that he should set him free" (Sahih Muslim, Hadith 3130)

When slapping the slave is such a heinous crime in the House of Islam, how can one think that Islam would allow the raping of slave women?

---

[1] Albāni classified it as Sahih.
[2] Ibn Taymiyya authenticated it in his *Majmu'a al-Fatawa* 4/360 saying 'Some have doubted this Hadīth for its chain but it is a Hasan Hadīth.'

May Allah give people the understanding of the things as they really are!

7- Why Muslim women are not allowed to marry Christian or Jewish men?

Quite often non-Muslims raise the question as to why Islam not allows Muslim women to marry Christian or Jewish men while it does allow Muslim men to marry Christian or Jewish women.

Muhammad Asad, the famous Muslim scholar much before his reversion to Islam witnessed a Greek asking the same to an illiterate Egyptian and the found an interesting reply. Here is the account in the very wording of Muhammad Asad. The Greek speaks to the Egyptian:

'You people say that your religion is so equitable. Couldst thou perhaps then tell why it is that Islam allows Muslim men to marry Christian or Jewish girls but does not allow your daughters and sisters to marry a Christian or Jew? Dost thou call this justice, huh?'

'I do, indeed,' replied the portly *umda* [a village headman] without a moment's hesitation, 'and shall tell thee why our religious law has been thus laid down. We Muslims do not believe that Jesus-may peace and God's blessings be upon him-was God's son, but we do consider him, as we consider Moses and Abraham and all the other Prophets of the Bible, a true Prophet of God, all of them having been sent to mankind in the same way as the Last Prophet, Muhammad-may God bless him and give him peace-was sent: and so, if a Jewish or Christian girl marries a Muslim, she may rest assured that none of the persons who are holy to her will ever be spoken of irreverently among her new family; while, on the other hand, should a Muslim girl marry a non-Muslim, it is certain that he whom she regards as God's Messenger will be Abused… and perhaps even by her own children: for do not children usually follow their father's faith? Dost thou think it would be fair to expose her to such a pain and humiliation?'

The Greek had no answer to this except an embarrassed shrug of his shoulders; but to me it seemed that simple, illiterate *umda* had, with that common sense so peculiar to his race, touched the very kernel of a very important problem.'

(Muhammad Asad, *The Road to Mecca*, 1985, Dar Al-Andalus, Gibraltar. pp 186-187)

8- Is there any bad omen in women?

Some evil hearted people often use certain narrations to argue that Islam looks down upon women and consider them evil or something of that sort. They use narrations like the following.

Narrated Abdullah bin 'Umar (RA): **Allah's Messenger (pbuh) said, "Evil omen is in the women, the house and the horse."** (Bukhari, Hadith 4703)

Same has been narrated through some other companions as well including Sayyidina Abu Huraira (RA) in

Mu'jam Tabarani al-Awst Hadith 7710.

1- <u>Truth about these narrations</u>:

But the fact remains that these pious companions only heard a part of Holy Prophet's (pbuh) saying. This is clarified through some other narrations. Read below:

Abu Hassan narrated: **Two men from Banu Aamir came to Sayyidah ‘Aisha and told her that Sayyidina Abu Huraira narrates that the Prophet (pbuh) said; 'Bad omen is in a house, a woman and a horse.' She was enraged, full of anger and said; 'By the One Who Revealed Qur’an on Muhammad, Allah's Messenger (pbuh) did not say that, what he actually said was that in the days of ignorance people used to take bad omen in these things.'**
(Musnad Ahmad Hadith 24841. Shu'aib 'Arna'ut said the Hadith is Sahih on the conditions of Sahih Muslim. Albani also authenticated it in *Sahiha* H.993)

It was mentioned before ‘Aisha that Abu Huraira narrates that Allah's Messenger (saaw) said; 'Bad omen is in three things; house, woman and horse.' So ‘Aisha said; "Abu Huraira does not remember it for he entered and Allah's Messenger (pbuh) said; 'May Allah destroy the Jews as they say bad omen is in three things; in a house, a woman and a horse.' So he heard the last part of the saying and did not hear the first part."
(Musnad Tiyalsi Hadith 1630. Albani classified it as Hasan in *Silsala Sahiha* 3/67).

So we can see that it was not the Holy Prophet (PBUH) who declared women to have bad omen, infact he only mentioned that people in ignorance thought this way, he rather rebuked Jews for such an idea. It was only that some of the Companions heard a part of his saying and a confusion emerged which was cleared by the emphatic words of Sayyidah ‘Aisha (RA), the Mother of the Believers.

Infact this is what Islam has to say about the issue in general and women in particular;

Makhmar bin Muawiyah said: **I heard Allah's Messenger (PBUH) say: "Do not believe in omens, and good fortune is to be found in three things: A woman, a horse and a house."**
(Sunan Ibn Majah Hadith 1993. Albani classified it as Sahih)

2- <u>Caution</u>!

Above Hadith from Bukhari no way casts a doubt on the authority of the collection or Authority of Hadith in general. It only highlights the importance of extensive and profound knowledge of Hadith before making any conclusions. Jumping to conclusions after just a fragmentary reading is indeed deplorable.

3- <u>What the Bible thinks of women?</u>

Mostly Christian Missionaries raise this issue, so let’s help them recall what their 'Holy' BIble speaks of women.

"And, behold, there was lifted up a talent of lead: and this is a woman that sitteth in the midst of the ephah. And he said, This is wickedness. And he cast it into the midst of the ephah; and he cast the weight of lead upon the mouth thereof." (Zechararariah 5:7-8)

So once again we find the cunning missionaries exposed!

9- Why are women required to seek husband's permission for voluntary fasting?

It's true that Islam asks the woman to seek husband's consent for voluntary fasting. Holy Prophet (PBUH) said:

"A woman should not fast (optional fasts) except with her husband's permission if he is at home (staying with her)." (Sahih Bukhari, Book of Nikah, Hadith 120)

To understand the logic behind this command we need to keep in mind few basic Islam principles.

1-Islam leaves no option for men and women to fulfill their desires except their spouses. Qur'an says about the husband wife relation:

"They are your garments and ye are their garments." (Surah Al-Baqarah 2:187)

2-Islam makes woman the 'Queen of the House' and gives her the responsibility of house affairs while man is made the manager of out-of-house matters. It's the man who is made responsible for financial matters and thus it is he who is to stay out of home and earn for his family.

So while out, he is much likely to come around any woman and this may cause some emotional upheaval within him. In such a situation Shariah has given a solution.

Holy Prophet (PBUH) said:

"When one of you sees a woman, he should come to his wife, for that will repel what he feels in his heart." (Sahih Muslim, Book of Marriage, Hadith 3240)

This is a very natural and rational solution to any such situation. Now if a man faces such a situation and his wife is fasting then it will be a problem as intimate relations nullify the fast. And this can cause serious problems especially when it becomes frequent. It is fact that men have less power to control their desire. It is in only for this reason Holy Prophet (PBUH) gave such a commandment. This is only for voluntary (*Nafal*) fasts and only for conditions when the husband is staying with the wife. If woman is at her parents' home or if the husband is away for some reason, she is not required to seek husband's consent.

Such an order is not given for men as woman are generally not supposed to come across such a situation as they are ideally required to fulfill in-house responsibilities and thus stay at home. Thus there is much less chance of their coming across the similar situation.

1- Why Muslims Kiss the Black Stone?

One of top-ten questions about Islam and Muslims is about kissing the Black Stone and facing the Holy Ka'ba during prayers. Some say that perhaps Muslims worship Ka'ba or the Black Stone and some tend to make absurd concordances e.g. a Christian site reads:

"*My question is do you see any difference between the Muslim practice of kissing showing reverence and venerating the Black Stone and the Catholic practice of pope John Paul II kissing the statute of the Virgin Mary with reverence and veneration?*"

1- What is the Black Stone?

Black Stone (al-Hajr al-Aswad) is a Holy Stone placed in the Holy Ka'ba.

2- What is it for?

When Muslims go for pilgrimage to Makkah this acts as starting point for circumambulating the Holy Ka'ba and has some symbolic significance.

As I mentioned it marks the start point of the circumambulation (*tawaaf*) of the Holy Ka'ba. Those who circumambulate in the immediate place around Ka'ba kiss it while those who cannot make up-to it just wave their hands towards it while there are people who circle the Ka'ba even from the first, second floors as well. They follow the mark parallel to the Black Stone as the start point of the *tawaaf*. Had there been something too special in this stone itself than it would have been mandatory for each and every pilgrim to physically touch and kiss which is not the case.

As its serves as a mark to something important so its just as if a soldier or some other person returns to his homeland after a long time so he kisses the soil of his land or shows admiration for some landmarks. Its his love, his affection for his homeland and nothing more. For itself soil is nothing, same way Black Stone for itself is nothing.

3- Do Muslims worship the Black Stone?

No, Muslims do not! The purpose of the Black Stone has been described above. Further there is more historic evidence that it’s not an object of Worship. In one of most sad events of Islamic history the city of Makkah was sacked by the Qaramatians in the year 930 C.E. They killed many pilgrims, desecrated the holy sites and took away the Black Stone to their seat of Power at Al-Hasa in Bahrayn. It was restored in the year 952 C.E. thus for about quarter of a century the stone was displaced from its location yet neither did Muslims turn to Al-Hasa for prayers during that period neither were the obligations of *Salah* (ritual prayers) and *Hajj* (obligatory pilgrimage) suspended. If it were an object of worship much consternation would have followed the unfortunate event.

4- Why kiss it?

And we Muslims kiss it just because of Holy Prophet Muhammad (PBUH) did it.

Read the following Hadith, it makes the whole thing crystal clear.

Narrated 'Abis bin Rabia: **'Umar came near the Black Stone and kissed it and said "No doubt, I know that you are a stone and can neither benefit anyone nor harm anyone. Had I not seen Allah's Messenger kissing you I would not have kissed you."**
(Bukhari Hadith 1494)

Similar has been narrated about the First Caliph, Abu Bakr (RA). See Suyuti's *Tarīkh Al-Khulafa* 1/35 cf. *Ilal al-Darqutni*

5- Catholic concept of Mary:

Contrary to the Islamic concept of showing respect to this stone what the Christians do is much more than this.

Firstly, making the idols of any holy person and its revering is no way comparable to Muslim's kissing the shapeless stone which for itself signifies nothing.

Secondly, Catholics do pray '*To Jesus through Mary*' thus believing in her as at least an intercessor. See This

I am saying 'at least' because this is something no catholic would ever deny. There were and still are people who openly called Mary, 'the Mother God', not merely 'Mother of God'. And even today there are people still who revere and venerate her as "GOD". And such people claim to be Catholics.

So showing veneration to the statue of Mary (May ALLAH bestow His blessings upon her) is nothing less than idol worship. No Muslims, even the most lunatic of them has any such belief about the Black Stone or the Holy Ka'ba. Thus such a concordance is nothing but mere absurdity.

2- Truth about the story of killing of Umm Qirfa

The way the story of killing of Umm Qirfa is presented by anti-Islamic polemicists is a perfect example of how they twist the facts.

1- The twisted story:

They give an impression as if she was a noble lady of great character and Muslims for no valid reason attacked her tribe and her killing in that specific manner, of tying her legs to two camels and driving them away and thus

tearing her apart, was carried out on by the command of the Holy Prophet (PBUH) himself. They also allege that her head was brought to the Holy Prophet (PBUH) and he ordered it to be paraded in Medina. Then they try to make an issue about her daughter who was taken as a prisoner and later gave birth to a child of Hazn bin Abu Wahb. They tend to convey as if she was raped. Indeed nothing can be far from truth then this.

2- Some issues with the narration:

First of all let me say that there is some confusion as to when was Umm Qirfa killed and who lead the campaign against her violent tribe. According to Baihiqi's Sunan al-Kubra 8/204 and Sunan Darqutni (H.3249) she was killed during the caliphate of Abu Bakr (RA) while most of the books on Sirah (life and times of the Holy Prophet PBUH) put it somewhere in 6th year A.H. Further according to Sahih Muslim (H.3299) Abu Bakr (RA) led the campaign during the lifetime of the Holy Prophet (PBUH). But accounts in the books of Sirah give the notion as if Zaid bin Harith (RA) was the leader. Polemicists, mostly Christians, generally refer to the books of Sirah so we shall reply considering those particular narrations.

3- The True Story in Full:

Here I give the full account as to what actually happened. Reading the accounts of the event given in both Sirat Ibn Hisham and Tabaqat Ibn S'ad will help us understand better.

a- Zaid bin Harith (RA) went on a trading journey to Syria and with him was the merchandise for Companions of the Prophet (PBUH). While he was near Wadi'l Qura' he encountered people from the Tribe of Badr of Fazara, whose leader was Umm Qirfa. They attacked him and his companions and snatched all they had of merchandise.

b- Some of his fellows were killed and he himself was carried wounded from the field. Zaid vowed that he would not wash his head for ritual purity (i.e. he vowed to abstain from sexual intercourse) until he fought the people of Fazara.

c- When he recovered from his wounds the Holy Prophet (PBUH) sent him to punish the treacherous people and ordered them to move by the night and rest by the day as a stratagem.

d- Zaid went and fought the Fazara in Wadi'l Qura, killed some of them. Qais bin Musahhar killed Mas'ada bin Hakama. Umm Qirfa, her daughter and Abdullah bin Mas'ada were taken as prisoners. Zaid ordered Qais bin Musahhar to kill Umm Qirfa and Qais killed her by putting a rope in her two legs, tying it to two camels and driving them in opposite directions until she was killed, ripped apart.
(Tabaqaat Ibn Sa'd 2/90 & Sirat Ibn Hisham 2/617)

In Sirat Halbiyya, another source they cite on this issue, it is clearly stated;

"Zaid bin Harith went on a trading expedition towards Syria and with him was the merchandise for the Companions of the Holy Prophet (PBUH). While he was near Wadi'l Qura he met a party from the Tribe of Fazara of Banu Badr. They attacked him and his companions and snatched all that was with them (of merchandize)." (Sirat Halabiyya 2/192)

e- Further we learn that Umm Qirfa in her capacity of being the tribal leader plotted to harm the Holy Prophet (PBUH) in person (Ar-Raheeq al-Makhtum p.457). In Sirat Halabiyya it is stated that;

"Zaid bin Harith ordered the killing of Umm Qirfa for she used to revile the Prophet, on whom be peace and blessings of Allah, and because she had prepared thirty riders from amongst he children and grand children and had asked them to attack Medina and kill Muhammad (PBUH)." (Sirat Halabaiyya 3/251)

4- <u>Facts and the Lies!</u>

Now this clarifies certain points.

a- It was the Tribe of Fazara, which was headed by Umm Qirfa, who first attacked Muslims who were merely on trading journey.

b- They killed Muslims and took their merchandise.

c- Muslims made a counter attack to punish the trigger-happy tribe.

d- There is no authentic report whether Holy Prophet (PBUH) ordered her killing specifically. Infact it was Zaid bin Harith (RA) who ordered her killing as she was, being the leader of the tribe, responsible for all that happened. And we just read Zaid himself had seen their aggression and merely survived it.

e- Her killing was perfectly justified as she led her tribe to commit violence against Muslims. She was no innocent a woman and was rather a hostile enemy.

f- The manner she was killed was not ordained by the Prophet (PBUH) but was carried on by the people who had undergone the terror practiced by her men. It was a reaction by such people; nevertheless it goes against the mannerism taught by Islam. And though such a behavior is deplorable, it is Umm Qirfa herself who is to be held responsible for such a reaction.

g- No authentic report makes any mention of her head being brought to the Prophet (PBUH) and then paraded in the streets of Medina. This is a myth and a lie! The books these slanderers produce as a reference are no authority as they are not written by trustworthy people and no authentic report in any of the classical books gives even a hint to such a happening.

5- <u>The Daughter of Umm Qirfa</u>:

a- Now coming to the daughter of Umm Qirfa. There are two reports and these liars refer to both of them. According to Sahih Muslim, she was given to Salama bin al-Akwa' and then Holy Prophet (PBUH) took her from Salama and she was given as a ransom for Muslim captives in Makkah. While according to Sirat Ibn Hisham etc she was taken from Salama and then given to Hazn bin Abu Wahb and later bore him a son, Abdul Rahman.

b- <u>She was not raped</u>: According to Sahih Muslim she was first given to Salama (RA) and he himself reports:

"…we arrived in Medina. I had not yet disrobed her when the Messenger of Allah (PBUH) met me in the street and said: 'Give me that girl, O Salama!' I said: 'Messenger of Allah, she has fascinated me. I had not yet disrobed her.' The next day, the Messenger of Allah (PBUH) again met me in the street, he said: 'O Salama, give me that girl, May God bless your father.' I said: 'She is for you. Messenger of Allah! By Allah! I have not yet disrobed her.' The Messenger of Allah (PBUH) sent her to the people of Makkah, and surrendered her as ransom for a number of Muslims who had been kept as prisoners at Makkah."

(Sahih Muslim, Hadith 3299)

Now one can observe that Salama (RA) said that he had not disrobed her when they reached Medina and again when the Holy Prophet (PBUH) met him in the street he told that he had not disrobed her. And even the next day, after the night having passed, when he was again asked for the girl, he testified that he had yet not disrobed her though she fascinated him.

This is enough proof that Salama didn't forcefully lay with her as it was against the teachings of Islam. Islam does not allow a man to forcefully have sexual intercourse with his slave woman, otherwise no could stop Salama from sleeping with a slave girl who fascinated him. And if she later gave birth bore Hazn bin Abu Wahb (RA) a son then it must have been by her own consent. We have seen the conduct of pious companion Salama (RA) and there is no reason to say that another pious companion Hazn (RA) would have violated the Islamic injunction and forced the daughter of Umm Qirfa into the intimate relation.

6- Indiscriminate killing of women and children ordained by Bible:

"Now go and smite Amalek, and utterly destroy all that they have, and spare them not; but slay both man and woman, infant and suckling, ox and sheep, camel and ass." (1Samuel 15:3)

Agreed that the Amalekites were accused of being violent to the Israel on their way out of Egypt but did Fazara, the tribe lead by Umm Qirfa, not do the same to Muslims who were merely on trading journey? But still there is difference. Muslims killed only those who fought and plotted against Muslims and even Holy Prophet (PBUH) in person, but why did the 'loving Father' in the Heavens above order the indiscriminate killing of men and women and even infants? Why infant and the suckling? No devil or saint can help the Christians come up with a justification for such cruelty.

7- Keep virgin women 'for yourselves'!

Bible puts the following words into the mouth of Moses (PBUH) alleging that he was inspired by God:

"Therefore kill all that are of the male sex, even of the children: and put to death the women, that have carnally known men. But the girls, and all the women that are virgins save for yourselves:" (Numbers 31:17-18)

Again why kill children? Were they also accused of deceiving the people of Israel? Why kill even the little ones for your weakness of Faith? Even the learned men of Christianity find no way to justify this barbarism attributed to holy men. Adam Clarke in his commentary to this verse says: ***"The little ones were safely lodged; they were taken to heaven and saved from the evil to come."*** What a justification! Reasoning and rationality can only mourn at it.
But 'all the girls and all the women that are virgins save for yourselves!' says the Bible attributing it to Moses (PBUH). What for? Were the virgin women not accused of deceiving the Israel while even the children were? I need not say that as you, the reader, can easily sense what the reason can be. And I urge you to give a verdict if it suits these slandering Christians to speak about Islam?

8- Kill the men, capture the women, and take the spoils!

“When thou comest nigh unto a city to fight against it, then proclaim peace unto it. And it shall be, if it make thee answer of peace, and open unto thee, then it shall be, that all the people that is found therein shall be tributaries unto thee, and they shall serve thee. And if it will make no peace with thee, but will make war against thee, then thou shalt besiege it: And when the LORD thy God hath delivered it into thine hands, thou shalt smite every male thereof with the edge of the sword: But the women, and the little ones, and the cattle, and all that is in the city, even all the spoil thereof, shalt thou take unto thyself; and thou shalt eat the spoil of thine enemies, which the LORD thy God hath given thee.” (Deuteronomy 20:10-14)

These verses are a slap on the face of all those evil mongers among the Christians who speak against the Islamic idea of Jihad, taking women as captives (*remember, Islam allows this under some special circumstances governed by rules that guarantee rights of those taken as captives*) and capturing spoils of war.It does not suit a person who dwells in a house made of delicate glass to throw stones at others!

“And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.”

3- Is there any contradiction between Ahadith about Muslims being in Hell?

There are certain Ahadith which say that anyone who says "There is no god but Allah" will not go to hell. On the other hand we find Ahadith where we are told that one who will have even a little faith will be taken out of the Hell eventually. Is this not a contradiction?

Sham Shamoun, the notorious anti-Islamic writer has written such things. (To read his article Click Here)
Let’s see what the truth is.

1- Different contexts of the Ahadith:

First of all let it be understood that Ahadith are to be taken in reference and an explanation to the Holy Qur’an because the purpose of Holy Prophet (PBUH) arrival was to explain and elaborate the Qur’an. So it will be a grave mistake to take either of them separately isolating it from the other.

The fact is that these Ahadith explain two different things. The whole thing if understood means that one who will utter the Islamic Shahadah “***La Ilaha Illa Allah***" (There is no god but Allah) with sincerity of heart will not remain in the Hell forever but the one who will make it a beacon of light for himself all the life and will not give anything importance when it clashes with the Will and Commands of Allah will never even taste it.

By uttering *Shahadah* one technically becomes a Muslim but True Faith requires a complete set of righteous deeds and struggle in the way of Allah.

Two verses from the Holy Qur'an explain it in profound manner. Allah says in the Holy Qur'an;

"The dwellers of the desert say: We believe. Say: You do not believe but say, We submit; and faith has not yet entered into your hearts; and if you obey Allah and His Messenger, He will not diminish aught of your deeds; surely Allah is Forgiving, Merciful.

The believers are only those who believe in Allah and His Messenger then they doubt not and struggle hard with their wealth and their lives in the way of Allah; they are the truthful ones."
(Qur'an 49:14-15)

2- Difference between faith professed and faith practiced:

This verse clearly tells that there is a difference between *professing* & *practicing*. Any Muslim who professes to be so with the sincerity of heart will not remain in the Hell forever which is the fate of the disbelievers as they reject the Truth out of their stubbornness. We are told about disbelievers in the Qur'an;

"Thus will Allah show them their deeds to be intense regret to them, and they shall not come forth from the fire." (Qur'an 2:167)

The Hell will be eternal abode only for the disbelievers who reject the true message of Islam in their crookedness.

But the person who not only professes but also practices Islam to his utmost will never taste Hell.

The general criterion of success has been set in the Holy Qur'an, Surah (chapter) 103, where Allah says;

"By (the Token of) Time (through the ages), Verily Man is in loss, Except such as have Faith, and do righteous deeds, and (join together) in the mutual teaching of Truth, and of Patience and Constancy."
(Qur'an 103:1-3)

This chapter lays down the ultimate criteria of success. One who will have all these qualities will NEVER enter Hell as he is a True Believer. See Qur'an 49:14-15 above.

One who lacks one or two is in loss to that degree. Truly the importance is of the order of narration here.

So we see that the Ahadith which say that those who says "*La Ilaha Illa Allah*" and spend their entire lives keeping in mind all the implications of such a vow will never taste Hell.

The first few Ahadith quoted by Shameless Sham Shamoun are in this context.

While those who merely believe in it as a creed but do not uphold to it all their lives will go through the punishment of Hell fire according to their deeds and will be taken out after their punishment. But as an eternal abode Hell fire is strictly forbidden for them as well.

The last Ahadith quoted are in this context.

3- <u>Questions for Missionaries:</u>

After showing his ignorance about Ahadith, Sham Shamoun has quoted some verses of the Bible to give an impression that a Christian only needs to have faith in Christ. But this is nothing more than a blatant lie. If you visit his page you will find that he has not quoted any unequivocal statement of his own "LORD" Jesus (PBUH).
Jesus (PBUH) clearly says in contradiction to his quoted verses.

According to Jesus (PBUH) keeping the Law is must for Salvation. See what Jesus (pbuh) said;

"For I say unto you, That <u>except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven.</u>" (Matthew 5:20)

Further we read in the Bible;

"And, behold, one came and said unto him, Good Master, what good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life? And he said unto him, Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is, God: but <u>if thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments</u>." (Matthew 19:16-17)

This is not all. The Insane Writer has even hidden the statements of James, 'the Brother of the Lord' about the issue. See the following of his words recorded in the Bible;

"What doth it profit, my brethren, though a man say he hath faith, and have not works? can faith save him?" (James 2:14)

"Even so faith, if it hath not works, is dead, being alone." (James 2:17)

"Ye see then how that <u>by works a man is justified</u>, and <u>not by faith only.</u>" (James 2:24)

4- <u>My Question</u>:

Can these statements of Bible be anyway reconciled with what he quoted. Is there anything in the Bible to clarify 'the difference between a faith professed and a faith practiced?'

If these people can ever try to understand Islam in an objective manner, they will find Islamic rubric the most composed one and full of blessings for humanity. But only if they try!

4- <u>Is the Islamic concept of God devoid of love?</u>

Some Christians give the impression that the concept of God in Islam is that of a vengeful merciless deity ever ready to punish his creation. But this is nothing but a blatant lie.

1- <u>Why Allah Punishes</u>?

Allah- the Only True God loves us all. He is not someone every ready to punish. And when He punishes, it is because it's required for He is Just. He punishes only for the sake of Justice for it will be unjust that a nice, good, well behaving, righteous person and a perverted transgressor remain equal both in this world and the hereafter. For our punishment adds nothing to His Glory.

Allah says in the Holy Quran;

"**What can Allah gain by your punishment**, **if ye are grateful and ye believe? Nay, it is Allah that recognizes (all good), and knows all things."** (Quran 4:147)

2- <u>Allah is Loving</u>:

There are hundreds of Quranic verses wherein Allah is called Merciful and Beneficent, attributes which are a reflections of ones Love and Compassion.

3- <u>His Attributes</u>:

As far as His attributes are concerned, the fact is the very thing Christians ask for is there in his 99 attributes.

One of Allah's attributes is *al-Wadood* which means 'loving'.

And this is from Holy Quran. It says;

"And He is the Forgiving, <u>the Loving</u>" (Al-Quran 85:14)

Yes, we Muslims don't say Allah is love, we say Allah is Loving just as we say He is Merciful not that, He is Mercy. This is because we are ultra cautious when it comes to *Tawheed* i.e. Monotheism.

INDEED ALLAH KNOWS THE BEST!

Closing Remarks

This collection comprises of 30 useful responses to oft-repeated questions and allegations against Islam. While I continue to write more responses I hope these will help my readers to assess my skills and come up with useful suggestions and objective criticism to help me improve which will insha'Allah help me produce more sound argumentations and be more witty in the planned second volume of the compendium.

I may be contacted for comments, suggestions, criticism or discussion at:

letmeturnthetables@gmail.com

I thank the Almighty for His continuous guidance and help!

* --------- *

فان كان صوابا فمن الله وحده لا شريك له وإن كان خطأ فمني ومن الشيطان

"So if [all] this was correct then it was from Allah, the One Who has no equal, and if it was erroneous then it was from me and the Satan."

Waqar Akbar Cheema

(Servant of Islam)